

2.0 PROPOSED PLAN AND DRAFT ALTERNATIVES

This chapter presents the Proposed Plan for managing public lands in the Monticello Field Office (FO). The five alternatives from the Draft RMP/Draft EIS are also provided to illustrate the progression to the Proposed Plan. In accordance with the federal guidelines implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), a range of reasonable alternatives was analyzed in the Draft RMP/Draft EIS that helped accomplish the objectives of the Proposed Plan. In crafting the Proposed Plan, the BLM considered all comments provided by the public, the Cooperating Agencies and internally on the Draft RMP/Draft EIS, as well as, issues and concerns raised during scoping, identified goals and objectives associated with the resources and allowable uses on the public lands, and competing uses under the multiple use and sustained yield mandates of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA). Chapter 2 has been organized in the following manner:

- Section 2.1 provides brief descriptions of the alternatives that were analyzed in detail in the Draft RMP/Draft EIS.
 - Table 2.1 defines the Proposed Plan and provides a summary of the Draft RMP/Draft EIS alternatives.
- Section 2.2 provides a comparative summary of the environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Plan and each alternative.
 - Table 2.2 provides a summary of the impacts.
- Section 2.3 outlines those alternatives the BLM has considered but has eliminated from detailed analysis, and the justifications for their dismissal from further evaluations.

2.1 BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE FIVE ALTERNATIVES ANALYZED IN THE DRAFT RMP/DRAFT EIS AND THE PROPOSED PLAN

The Draft RMP/Draft EIS analyzed five alternatives in detail. Alternative A (the "No Action" Alternative, a continuation of the existing 1991 RMP) was presented for comparison to the four action alternatives. There are four action alternatives in addition to the Proposed Plan; Alternatives B, C, D, and E, represent variations in the existing management and are generally distinguished by the degree of resource protection use.

The Proposed Plan/Final EIS does not carry forward Alternative C (the Preferred Alternative) from the Draft RMP/EIS. Rather, the Proposed Plan/RMP consists of a combination of all the alternatives, including Alternative C from the Draft RMP/EIS and information that was modified in response to public comment. It is based on public comments; the BLM and Cooperating Agency review; and provides the best means to accommodate the widest range of public and agency concerns over resources and resource uses. It provides for continued access to and development of resources with stipulations and mitigation to protect natural and cultural resources.

Alternative A (No Action) would be a continuation of existing management practices defined in the San Juan Resource Management Plan (RMP) (BLM 1991a, as amended). The current plan maintained "multiple use management while providing protection or enhancement to unique and sensitive resources." Areas were designated as open, limited, and closed to off-highway vehicle

(OHV; also referred to as "off-road vehicle") travel. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs) were used extensively to manage cultural and recreation resource and use.

Alternative B would minimize human activities, offer more protection for wildlife and other natural resources, and favor natural systems over commodities development. Decisions include minimizing routes and enlarging crucial habitat for wildlife. All potential ACECs are considered in this alternative. All eligible wild and scenic rivers (WSRs) are considered for suitability in this alternative. Oil and gas leasing stipulations were determined and used to protect sensitive resources.

Alternative C was identified as the Preferred Alternative in the Draft RMP and would balance the protection of important environmental values and sensitive resources with commodities development. All areas were designated as open, limited, and closed to OHV travel and routes were designated to allow access and protect resources. A balanced use of ACECs and WSRs was used to protect important resource values.

Alternative D emphasizes commodities development over the protection of natural resources. No ACECs were considered in this alternative. No eligible WSR segments would be determined as suitable under this alternative. Protection of wildlife habitat was minimized to that required by law, regulation, or policy. Access was maximized, as no acres were closed to OHV travel and almost the entire area was designated as limited to OHV travel.

Alternative E would be based on Alternative B, except it emphasizes protection of 582,360 acres of non-Wilderness Study Area (WSA) lands with wilderness characteristics and allows for other activities consistent with that emphasis. Large areas on the west side of the Monticello FO would be difficult to access or do any kind of surface-disturbing activities. Wilderness characteristics would be enhanced as would adjacent wilderness found in WSAs.

The Proposed Plan consists of a combination of proposed decisions taken from an array of all the alternatives but using Alternative C (Preferred Alternative) from the Draft RMP/Draft EIS as its base. This combination of decisions was developed in response to internal, public and cooperating agency comments. It provides a balanced means to accommodate the widest range of public and agency concerns over resources and resource uses. It provides for continued access to and development of resources with stipulations and mitigation to protect natural and cultural resources.

Table 2.1 provides a detailed description of the Proposed Plan and alternatives carried forward from the Draft EIS; the table is organized alphabetically by resource (i.e., air quality, cultural, fire management, etc.). There are twenty resources listed. Each section includes the Proposed Plan goals, management based on actions common to the Proposed Plan and the Draft RMP alternatives, and then itemizes the specific management prescriptions for the Proposed Plan—as well as those management prescriptions for the alternatives from the Draft RMP. If management prescriptions for two different alternatives were the same, then it is merely indicated by a "same as Alternative..." Occasionally, the proposed management decisions are the same but the acreage or the time frames they are applicable to changes, this is indicated in the text.

2.1.1 BRIEF SUMMARY AND HIGHLIGHTS OF THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALTERNATIVES IN TABLE 2.1

The major resources/uses and associated issues identified during scoping were travel management, recreation, oil and gas leasing and development, special designations (ACECs, WSRs, and WSAs), special status species, wildlife, and non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. These resources/uses, among others, are displayed under the Proposed Plan and range of management alternatives from the Draft RMP that set forth different priorities and measures to emphasize some uses or resource values over others to achieve specific goals or objectives outlined in detail in Table 2.1. Below is a brief summary of the range of alternatives for those major resources/uses brought forward during scoping. Much more detail for each of these resources and uses, among others, and their proposed management is in Table 2.1.

2.1.1.1 TRAVEL MANAGEMENT

All public lands are required to have OHV area designations. Areas must be classified as open, limited, or closed to motorized travel activities. OHV designation areas, or categories, are listed by alternative. Summary Table A portrays how travel and access management would be designated under each alternative.

Summary Table A. OHV Acreage and Mileage Designations by Alternative

	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Open	611,310	0	2,311	2,311	0	0
Limited—Seasonal Restrictions	540,260	N/A	3.8 ¹	N/A	N/A	8.0
Limited—Existing Roads and Trails	570,390	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Limited—Designated Roads and Trails	218,780	1,359,417	1,362,142	1,780,807	812,679	1,364,453
Closed	276,430	423,698	418,667	0	970,436	418,667
Total²	N/A³	1,783,115	1,780,809	1,783,118	1,783,115	1,783,120
Miles of Routes Designated	2,1794	1,521	1,947	2,205	1,342	1,947

This acreage applies to Arch Canyon.

²Acreage figures may vary by alternative due to the changes in GIS technology and variances in shapefiles.

³Acres are not additive under this alternative because of overlap between limited use categories.

⁴ Miles of existing routes; but undesignated in the 1991 San Juan RMP.

The BLM, in preparing its RMP designations and its implementation-level travel management plans, is following policy and regulation authority found at 43 C.F.R. Part 8340; 43 C.F.R. Subpart 8364; and 43 C.F.R. Subpart 9268. Where the authorized officer determines that OHVs

are causing or would cause considerable adverse impacts, the authorized officer shall close or restrict such areas. The public would be notified.

The BLM could impose limitations on types of vehicles allowed on specific designated routes if monitoring indicates that a particular type of vehicle is causing disturbance to the soil, wildlife habitat, cultural or vegetative resources, especially by off-road travel in an area that is limited to designated routes.

Where routes would remain available for motorized use within WSAs, such use could continue on a conditional basis. Use of the existing routes in the WSAs ("ways" when located within WSAs—see Glossary) could continue as long as the use of these routes does not impair wilderness suitability, as provided by the IMP (BLM 1995). If Congress designates the area as wilderness, the routes will be closed. In the interim, if use and/or noncompliance are found through monitoring efforts to impair the area's suitability for wilderness designation, the BLM would take further action to limit use of the routes, or close them. The continued use of these routes, therefore, is based on user compliance and nonimpairment of wilderness values.

2.1.1.2 RECREATION

Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs) are proposed to manage intensively used recreation areas, and do not restrict other uses. In Alternative B, nonmotorized recreation is emphasized; in Alternative D, motorized recreation is emphasized. Alternative C provides opportunities for both nonmotorized and motorized recreation. Alternative E emphasizes nonmotorized recreation and protection of naturalness, outstanding opportunities for solitude, and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation. The Proposed Plan provides opportunities for motorized and nonmotorized recreation including opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation while providing for protection of sensitive resources. These are depicted in Summary Table B.

Summary Table B. SRMA Acreage by Alternative

Category	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
SRMAs	614,490	528,856	525,512	525,018	508,856	554,721

2.1.1.3 OIL AND GAS LEASING AND DEVELOPMENT

One of the major decisions in a land-use plan (LUP) is to determine which areas should be 1) open to leasing subject to the terms and conditions of the standard lease form stipulations, 2) areas open to leasing subject to moderate constraints such as timing limitations (TL) or controlled surface use (CSU) restrictions, 3) areas open to leasing subject to major constraints such as NSO stipulations, or 4) areas unavailable to leasing. All of these proposed decisions must be consistent with the goals and objectives of other resources and uses for each alternative. Summary Table C depicts how oil and gas leasing would be managed under each alternative.

Summary Table C. Oil and Gas Leasing Stipulations Acreage, by Alternative

Stipulation	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Standard	578,604	365,170	629,472	962,283	213,290	495,432
TL/CSU	659,626	876,740	719,501	421,000	545,641	732,477
NSO	161,224	125,105	39,323	14,175	53,915	64,848
Closed	385,316	416,612	395,329	386,853	974,463	491,552

In addition, this planning revision has applied the same oil and gas stipulations to all other surface-disturbing activities where they are not contrary to laws, regulations, or policy under all of the action alternatives. For example, if an area has a timing stipulation on it for oil and gas development, the BLM would also apply that same timing stipulation on a right-of-way (ROW) construction proposal or an organized recreational event.

2.1.1.4 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

2.1.1.4.1 POTENTIAL AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN

The *Federal Register* Notice of Intent (June 2003) for this plan revision requested ACEC nominations from the public for consideration in the planning effort. In order to be considered and carried forward into the range of alternatives for planning, an ACEC must meet the relevance and importance criteria in 43 CFR 1610.7-2(a), and must require special management. The Monticello FO received and evaluated a total of 17 ACEC nominations of which 13 were determined to meet the relevance and importance criteria. The relevance and importance criteria encompass scenery, sensitive plant species, rare plants, cultural and historic resources, wildlife, fish, natural systems, and natural hazards. Summary Table D shows that all of the 13 potential ACECs were brought forward into Alternative B for designation consideration, and 7 potential ACECs were brought forward into Alternative C for designation consideration. There are 10 existing designated ACECs in the Monticello Planning Area (MPA), and therefore 10 in Alternative A. There were no ACECs brought forward for consideration in Alternative D. Where ACECs are designated, special management attention would be directed at the relevant and important values, resources, natural systems and/or natural hazards.

Summary Table D. Proposed Total Acreage and Number of Potential ACECs by Alternative

Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
488,616	521,141	76,764	0	521,141	74,403
10	12	7	0	12	7

2.1.1.4.2 WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS

During planning, the BLM must assess all eligible river segments and determine which are suitable or unsuitable per Section 5(d)(1) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1958, as amended. The Monticello FO reviewed all river segments for WSR eligibility and suitability as

part of the RMP process. Twelve river segments were found to meet the eligibility criteria. The BLM Manual 8351 (BLM 1993b) directs the BLM to provide tentative classifications of Wild, Scenic, or Recreational to the eligible river segments. Under the No Action Alternative (Alternative A), six river segments were identified as eligible for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. These six segments would be managed to protect their free-flowing nature and outstandingly remarkable values until their suitability for inclusion in the Wild and Scenic River System is determined. Alternative B and E would recommend and manage all of the segments as suitable for Congressional designation into the system, and Alternative C would recommend three river segments as suitable for Congressional designation into the system. The number of miles of rivers recommended suitable for designation are included in Summary Table E below.

Summary Table E. WSRs Recommended Suitable for the Proposed Plan, Including Draft EIS by Alternatives

Alternative	BLM River Miles	Total River Miles	Classifications
A ¹	56.8	59.2	Recreational, Scenic, Wild
B	92.4	115.3	Recreational, Scenic, Wild
C	18.4	26.9	Scenic, Wild
D	0	0	NA
E	92.4	115.3	Recreational, Scenic, Wild
Proposed Plan	35.7	44.3	Scenic, Wild

¹ Miles of river determined eligible under the 1991 San Juan RMP; but suitability not determined.

The BLM would work with the State of Utah and other federal agencies to reach consensus regarding recommendations to Congress for the inclusion of rivers in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. Besides applying consistent criteria across agency jurisdictions, the joint review would avoid piecemealing of river segments in logical watershed units in the state. Actual designation of river segments would only occur through congressional action or as a result of Secretarial decision at the request of the governor in accordance with provisions of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (the Act). The BLM will work with the state and the agencies involved to coordinate its decision making on WSR issues and to achieve consistency wherever possible.

The BLM recognizes that water resources on most river and stream segments within the State of Utah are already fully allocated. Where stream segments are designated on public lands being managed under this Plan, the BLM will continue to work with affected local, state, federal, and tribal partners to identify in-stream flows necessary to meet critical resource needs including values related to the designation. The BLM would then seek to jointly promote innovative strategies, community-based planning, and voluntary agreements with water users, under State law, to address those needs.

Should designations occur on any river segment as a result of Secretarial or congressional action, existing rights, privileges, and contracts would be protected. Under Section 12 of the Act, termination of such rights, privileges, and contracts may happen only with the consent of the affected non-federal party. A determination by the BLM of eligibility and suitability for the inclusion of rivers on public lands to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System does not create new water rights for the BLM. Federal reserved water rights for new components of the National

Wild and Scenic Rivers System are established at the discretion of Congress. If water is reserved by Congress when a river component is added to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, it would come from water that is not appropriated at the time of designation, in the amount necessary to protect features that led to the river's inclusion into the system. The BLM's intent would be to leave existing water rights undisturbed and to recognize the lawful rights of private, municipal, and state entities to manage water resources under state law to meet the needs of the community. Federal law, including Section 13 of the Act and the McCarren Amendment (43 United States Code [U.S.C.] 666), recognizes state jurisdiction over water allocation in designated streams. Thus, it is the BLM's position that existing water rights and existing developments on such streams would not be affected by designation or the creation of the possible federal reserved water right. The BLM would seek to work with upstream water users and applicable agencies to ensure that water flows are maintained at a level sufficient to sustain the values for which affected river segments were designated.

2.1.1.4.3 WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS

The Monticello FO manages 13 WSAs totaling approximately 389,444 acres. Where routes would remain available for motorized use within WSAs, such use could continue on a conditional basis. Use of the existing routes in the WSAs ("ways" when located within WSAs—see Glossary) could continue as long as the use of these routes does not impair wilderness suitability, as provided by the IMP (BLM 1995). If Congress designates the area as wilderness, the routes will be closed. In the interim, if use and/or noncompliance are found through monitoring efforts to impair the area's suitability for wilderness designation, the BLM would take further action to limit use of the routes, or close them. The continued use of these routes, therefore, is based on user compliance and nonimpairment of wilderness values. Please see the Special Designation section of Table 2.1 for details.

2.1.1.5 SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

Land-use planning decisions should be consistent with the BLM's mandate to recover listed species, and should be consistent with objectives and recommended actions in approved recovery plans, conservation agreements and strategies, memorandums of understanding (MOUs), and applicable biological opinions for threatened and endangered species. The Monticello PA has 10 threatened, endangered, and candidate wildlife, fish, and plant species. They are the black-footed ferret, California Condor, Southwestern Willow Flycatcher, Mexican Spotted Owl, Western Yellow-billed Cuckoo, bonytail, Colorado pikeminnow, humpback chub, razorback sucker, and the Navajo sedge. Standard stipulations have been developed in coordination with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) under all alternatives.

In addition, there are 59 Special Status Species (please refer to Section 3.16.3.1 Special Status Species, Tables 3.54 and 3.55 for complete lists) where there is some discretion in management.

Timing Limitations and Controlled Surface Use stipulations are applied to the habitat of some species and are spread by alternative.

2.1.1.6 WILDLIFE

In planning, the BLM should identify actions and area-wide use restrictions needed to achieve desired population and habitat conditions while maintaining a thriving natural ecological balance

and multiple-use relationships. The range of alternatives for wildlife actions and habitats includes:

- **Pronghorn antelope:** A Timing Limitation stipulation for surface-disturbing activities, including oil and gas development would be applied to pronghorn habitat. The size of habitat varies by alternative.
- **Desert bighorn sheep:** Recommendations from the BLM Bighorn Sheep Rangeland Management Plan (BLM 1993c) would be adhered to where practicable. On-site mitigation to replace forage and browse species lost would be required in bighorn habitat. The size of the habitat varies by alternative.
- **Deer and elk:** A Timing Limitation stipulation for surface-disturbing activities, including oil and gas development. Timing limitation and acreage vary by alternative.

2.1.1.7 NON-WSA LANDS WITH WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

During planning, the Monticello FO identified decisions to protect or preserve non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (naturalness, outstanding opportunities for solitude, and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation). There are 582,360 acres that were found to have wilderness characteristics outside of existing WSAs; all of them would be protected and managed to preserve their wilderness characteristics values in Alternative E. Likewise, the Proposed Plan would address management of five units totaling 88,871 acres. There would not be specific prescriptions for wilderness characteristics under Alternatives A, B, C, and D. However, some of these areas would receive indirect beneficial protections from other resource prescriptions such as NSO, closed to leasing, VRM Class I, and limited or closed to OHV use.

Table 2.1 provides a comprehensive description of the Proposed Plan and the Draft EIS alternatives carried forward for detailed environmental analysis.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL RESOURCES
<p>The goals and objectives described below apply to the Proposed Plan in addition to Draft RMP Alternatives B, C, D, and E. Goals and objectives for Alternative A (No Action Alternative) are described in the 1991 San Juan Resource Area RMP (BLM 1991a). Acreage figures for Alternative A in this matrix may vary slightly from the acreages in the existing 1991 San Juan RMP. This variance is due to the current GIS technology that was used to recalculate more accurate acreages for existing management areas and designations.</p> <p>For the purpose of this plan, OHVs are defined as any motorized vehicle capable of or designed for travel on or immediately over land, water, or other natural terrain, excluding the following: 1) any non-amphibious registered motorboat; 2) any military, fire, emergency, or law enforcement vehicle while being used for emergency purposes; 3) any vehicle whose use is expressly authorized by an authorized officer, or otherwise officially approved; 4) any vehicle in official use; and 5) any combat or combat support vehicle when used in times of national defense emergencies. Designated routes can be categorized as mechanized only (bicycles), single-track motorized (dirt bikes), two-track motorized (four-wheelers, jeeps), available to all vehicles, or any combination of these categories.</p> <p>Wilderness Study Areas would be managed according to the Interim Management Policy and Guidelines for Lands under Wilderness Review (IMP).</p> <p>All ACECs would be retained in public ownership, would be subject to appropriate fire management response, and would have travel limited to designated routes unless otherwise noted.</p> <p><u>Education and Interpretation</u></p> <p>The BLM would work with its partners, including local school districts and universities, to develop a variety of opportunities to promote education, research, and interpretation on public lands.</p> <p><u>Fire, Drought, and Natural Disasters</u></p> <p>The BLM would coordinate actions with affected parties where natural resources may be impacted by fire, drought, insects and diseases, or natural disasters.</p> <p><u>Monitoring</u></p> <p>The BLM would conduct monitoring for all resources to determine the effectiveness of management prescriptions in achieving RMP objectives or making progress toward them.</p> <p><u>Utah Standards for Rangeland Health</u></p> <p>BLM lands would be managed and uses would be authorized in a manner consistent with meeting or moving toward meeting Utah's Standards for Rangeland Health (BLM 1997). The current Utah Standards for Rangeland Health (as revised), augmented with ecological condition and trend objectives, would be incorporated across all resource programs as a minimum management objective. Management prescriptions in the form of constraints to use, terms and conditions, and stipulations may be needed to meet resource objectives and/or to comply with current regulations. Management prescriptions may consider, but would not be limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Surface-disturbing activities: These would be closely monitored to ensure compliance with authorizations/permits, conditions of approval, or terms and conditions. Actions minimizing new surface disturbance, as well as actions insuring successful reclamation, would be of paramount concern. During periods of drought, the BLM could require additional actions such as changes to standard seed mix compositions, amounts of seed, and method of application. Methods to ensure successful revegetation following disturbance could include hydromulching, installation of drip irrigation, and/or temporary fencing to exclude ungulate grazing/browsing.● Livestock grazing: Active livestock use would be authorized in animal unit months (AUMs), season, and duration to meet static (no apparent trend) to upward trends towards achieving site-specific resource objectives. In the case of fire, drought, insects and diseases, or other natural disasters, the BLM would work cooperatively to implement a grazing strategy on an individual grazing allotment basis and make changes to the annual grazing authorizations as appropriate within the limits of the existing permit and in accordance with the grazing regulations. The BLM may temporarily close allotments or portions of allotments to grazing where it is determined that other, less drastic measures would not avoid degradation of vegetative resources. Temporary changes to active permitted use or grazing practices, or non-use may also be implemented voluntarily by the permittee with BLM consent.● Wildlife management: During periods of prolonged dryness or drought or other natural disaster, to the extent that wildlife grazing ungulate populations may not be sustainable and/or impacts to the resource habitats may occur due to competition for water and/or available forage and/or overall animal health is compromised, the BLM may enter into discussions with the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR) regarding temporary adjustments in herd numbers and overall management options to address the effects of drought.● Recreation: During periods of prolonged dryness or drought, the BLM, in cooperation with local and state fire management agencies, may limit campfires to established fire rings or fully contained fires. The last resort would be to close the public lands to campfires of any kind.● OHV use: OHV use during period of prolonged dryness could be further restricted to designated routes. If site-specific conditions warrant, closure to OHVs could be implemented to minimize vehicle-induced injury or damage to rangeland and/or woodland resources, and to minimize the potential of spark caused fires.● SOPs: These would be implemented as described in Appendix I.
AIR QUALITY
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES
Ensure that authorized uses on public lands meet or comply with and support federal, state, and local laws and regulations.
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ALTERNATIVES
<p>The best available control technology, recommended by the Utah Division of Air Quality (UDAQ), would be applied as needed to meet air quality standards.</p> <p>Prescribed burns would be consistent with the State of Utah Division of Environmental Quality (UDEQ) permitting process and timed in conjunction with meteorological conditions so as to minimize smoke impacts.</p> <p>The BLM would comply with Utah Air Conservation (UAC) Regulation R307–205, which prohibits the use, maintenance, or construction of roadways without taking appropriate dust abatement measures.</p> <p>The BLM would comply with the current Smoke Management Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the BLM, the U.S. Forest Service (USFS), and UDAQ. The MOA, in accordance with UAC regulation R301-204, requires reporting size, date of burn, fuel type, and estimated air emissions from each prescribed burn.</p> <p>The BLM would manage emissions to prevent deterioration to air quality in Class I Airsheds.</p> <p>The BLM will continue to work cooperatively with state, federal, and tribal entities in developing air quality assessment protocols to address cumulative impacts and regional air quality issues.</p> <p>The BLM will continue to work cooperatively with the Utah Airshed Group to manage emissions from wildland and prescribed fire activities.</p> <p>National Ambient Air Quality Standards are enforced by the Utah Department of Environmental Quality, Division of Air Quality (UDEQ-DAQ), with EPA oversight. Special requirements to reduce potential air quality impacts will be considered on a case-by-case basis in processing land-use authorizations.</p> <p>The BLM will utilize best management practices (BMPs) and site-specific mitigation measures, when appropriate, based on site-specific conditions, to reduce emissions and enhance air quality. Examples of these types of measures can be found in the Four</p>

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

Corners Air Quality Task Force Report of Mitigation Options, November 1, 2007.					
Project specific analyses will consider use of quantitative air quality analysis methods (i.e., modeling), when appropriate as determined by the BLM, in consultation with state, federal, and tribal entities.					
CULTURAL RESOURCES					
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES Identify, preserve, and protect important cultural resources and ensure that they are available for appropriate uses by present and future generations (FLPMA, Section 103[c], 201 [a] and [c]; National Historic Preservation Act, Section 110 [a]; Archaeological Resources Protection Act, Section 14 [a]). Seek to reduce imminent threats and resolve potential conflicts from natural- or human-caused deterioration, or potential conflict with other resource uses (FLPMA, Section 103 [c], NHPA 106, 110 [a][2]) by ensuring that all authorizations for land use and resource use comply with the NHPA Section 106.					
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ALTERNATIVES The BLM would nominate appropriate cultural resource objects, sites, districts, and multiple listings to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Priority geographic areas for new field inventory pursuant to Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and Section 14 of the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) would be identified based upon a probability for unrecorded important resources. These inventories would be conducted as funding is available and as opportunities arise. The BLM would ensure that all authorizations for land and resource use would comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), consistent with and subject to the objectives established in the RMP for the proactive use of cultural properties in the public interest. Impacts to any NRHP-listed or eligible cultural resource sites, objects, or districts would be mitigated in accordance with 43 CFR 800, generally through avoidance of cultural sites. Should it be determined the cultural resources eligible or listed on the NRHP cannot be avoided, consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) would be initiated and the procedures identified in the National Programmatic Agreement and the Utah State BLM Protocol for meeting the BLM's responsibilities under the NHPA would be followed. The BLM would consult with Native American tribes to identify, protect, and maintain access for areas of traditional and religious use that includes but is not limited to burials, rock art, traditional use areas, religiously active areas, and sacred sites. Burial sites, associated burial goods, and sacred items would be protected in accordance with the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) and the Archaeological Resources Protection Act. Cultural resources would be evaluated according to National Register criteria (36 CFR Part 60.4) and assigned to appropriate use categories as the basis for management decisions.* Cultural sites, including ethnographic properties, would continue to be allocated to one of six management use categories: experimental, discharged from management, public, scientific, traditional, and conservation.* The BLM would conduct a consultation process to identify both the resource management concerns and the strategies for addressing them through an interactive dialogue with appropriate Native American communities. The BLM would work with tribes and other communities with traditional linkage to public lands to identify places of traditional cultural and religious importance. To the extent allowed by statute, regulation, and policy, such locations would be managed to minimize impacts to important values and to allow continued access for traditional purposes. When new sites are discovered, interim protection may be applied until Section 106 consultation and NAGPRA (CFR 10) processes are completed, if warranted. The BLM would provide for legitimate field research by qualified scientists and institutions. The BLM would work with local communities and other groups to foster heritage tourism throughout the Monticello PA. Protective measures would be established and implemented for sites, structures, objects, and traditional use areas that are important to tribes with historical and cultural connections to the land, in order to maintain the view shed and intrinsic values, as well as the auditory, visual, and esthetic settings of the resources. Protection measures for undisturbed cultural resources and their natural settings would be developed in compliance with regulatory mandates and Native American consultation.					
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ACTION ALTERNATIVES A Cedar Mesa management plan would be developed for culturally sensitive areas unless included in other integrated activity plans. The CRMP would be consistent with the goals and objectives with the Monticello RMP. Such plans would include protective measures such as restrictions and limitations on recreation around cultural at-risk areas and sites, Native American consultation, and regulatory compliance. These plans would also include but not be limited to developing cultural monitoring systems; identifying sites and areas in need of stabilization and protective measures (e.g., fences, surveillance equipment); developing research designs for selected sites/areas; designating sites/areas for interpretive and educational development; identifying areas for cultural inventory where federal undertakings are expected to occur; and developing specific mitigation measures. The plan would designate sites, districts, landmarks, and landscapes that would be nominated for inclusion on the NRHP. The BLM would proactively reduce hazardous fuels or mitigate the potential hazard around archaeological and cultural sites that are susceptible to destruction by fire from prescribed or wildland fire. Management response to fire would follow the guidelines in the Moab District Fire Management Plan. The BLM would promote collaborative partnerships to assist in meeting management goals and objectives for cultural resources. Domestic pets and pack animals would not be allowed in cultural sites or on archaeological resources as defined in ARPA. Ropes and other climbing aids would not be allowed for access to cultural sites or archaeological resources as defined in ARPA, except for emergencies or administrative needs. Camping would not be allowed within cultural sites or archaeological resources as defined in ARPA. Cultural sites may be closed to visitation when they are determined to be at risk or pose visitor safety hazards.					
Comb Ridge Cultural Special Management Area (CSMA) (Map 2)					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
No was identified in the 1991 San Juan Resource Area RMP, as amended. These lands are managed according to the 1991 San Juan RMP prescriptions.	Comb Ridge (30,752) would be managed as a CSMA with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Managed for heritage tourism and traditional cultural values.	Comb Ridge (30,752 acres) would be managed CSMA as in Alternative B except for the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Available for private and/or commercial use of woodland products including on-site	Comb Ridge would not be managed as a CSMA. The area would be managed with the same management prescriptions as the adjacent areas which are: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Available for private and/or	Comb Ridge (30,752 acres) would be managed as a CSMA. with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Managed for heritage tourism and traditional cultural values.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Comb Ridge (30,752 acres) would become a Recreation Management Zone within the Cedar Mesa SRMA. A selection of prescriptions from Alternatives A–E have been carried over into the SRMA. See the Recreation section in this Chapter for SRMA prescriptions.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Unavailable for geophysical work, disposal of mineral materials, and recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.• Available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO.• Open for campfires at designated sites.• Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products, including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.• Available for livestock use but it may be limited if cultural resources are impacted.• Available for range, wildlife habitat, and watershed improvements.• Available for non–surface-disturbing vegetation treatments.• OHV use limited to designated routes.• The Comb Wash Campground would be developed (as proposed in 1991 San Juan RMP).• Closed to dispersed camping. Camping limited to designated camp areas and campgrounds with designated access routes and parking.• Establishment of a permit system for day and overnight use if necessary to protect cultural resources.• In camp areas without toilets, human waste must be packed out.• Designation and signing of trails from parking areas to cultural sites, which are included in the Cultural Management Plan.• Limited parking for day use to designated areas.	<p>collection of dead wood for campfires.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Available for range, wildlife habitat, and watershed improvements, and vegetation treatments.• Available for surface-disturbing land treatments if consistent with current law, regulations, policy, and management plan objectives.• Commercial group size limited to 12.	<p>commercial use of woodland products including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Available for range, wildlife habitat, and watershed improvements, and vegetation treatments.• Available for livestock use but it may be limited if cultural resources are impacted.• Available for surface-disturbing land treatments if consistent with management plan objectives.• OHV use limited to designated routes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Unavailable for geophysical work, disposal of mineral materials, and recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.• Unavailable for oil and gas leasing.• Open for campfires at designated sites.• Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.• Available for livestock use but it may be limited if cultural resources are impacted.• Maintenance of existing improvements allowed; no new improvements.• Available for non–surface-disturbing vegetation treatments.• Limited OHV use to designated routes and closed in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.• Development of the Comb Wash Campground (as proposed in 1991 San Juan RMP).• Closed to dispersed camping. Camping limited to designated camp areas and campgrounds with designated access routes and parking.• Establishment of a permit system for day and overnight use if necessary to protect cultural resources.• In camp areas without toilets, human waste must be packed out.• Hiking to cultural sites limited to designated trails that would be developed in the CRMP. Group size limited to 12 people.• Limited parking for day use to designated areas.	
<p>Butler Wash, east of Comb Ridge</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No allocation limit• No private group size limit• No commercial permit or group size limit• Open to camping• Open to OHV use	<p>Butler Wash, east of Comb Ridge</p> <p>Manage the same as Comb Ridge with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Private group size limited to 6.• Commercial group size limited to 12.• Butler Wash side canyons close	<p>Butler Wash, east of Comb Ridge</p> <p>Manage the same as Comb Ridge and the same as Alternative B with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Private group size limited to 8.• Commercial group size limited to 12.	<p>Butler Wash, east of Comb Ridge</p> <p>Manage the same as Comb Ridge with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Private group size limited to 12.• Commercial group size limited to 12.	<p>Butler Wash, east of Comb Ridge</p> <p>Manage the same as Comb Ridge with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Private group size limited to 6.• Commercial group size limited to 12.• Butler Wash canyons closed to	<p>Butler Wash, east of Comb Ridge</p> <p>Would be managed as part of the Comb Ridge Recreation Management Zone (RMZ) within the Cedar Mesa SRMA. A selection of prescriptions from Alternatives A–E have been carried over into the SRMA RMZ. See Recreation section in this Chapter for prescriptions.</p>

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Dogs allowed• No fees• Grazing allowed• Fires allowed	<p>to domestic pets and pack animals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Designated primitive campsites.• If necessary, managed as part of Cedar Mesa permits and regulations, including regulations and permit fees. Groups would view low-impact video at Kane Gulch Ranger Station or Sand Island.			<p>domestic pets and pack animals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Designated primitive campsites.• Managed as if part of Cedar Mesa permits and regulations, including regulations and permit fees. Groups would view low-impact video at Kane Gulch Ranger Station or Sand Island.	
Tank Bench Cultural Special Management Area (CSMA) (Map 2)					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
No CSMA was identified in the 1991 San Juan Resource Area RMP, as amended. These lands are managed according to the 1991 San Juan RMP prescriptions.	<p>Tank Bench (2,646 acres) would be managed as a CSMA with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Hiking limited to designated trails.• Group size limited to 12 people.• Human waste must be packed out.• Closed to domestic pets and pack animals.• Closed to OHV use.• Available for livestock use but it may be limited if cultural resources are impacted.• Available for watershed, range, and wildlife habitat improvements.• Available for non–surface-disturbing vegetation treatments.• Closed to campfires.• Closed to private and/or commercial use of woodland products (including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires) with the exception of traditional cultural uses, as long as they do not adversely impact other resource values.• Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry, and unavailable for disposal of mineral materials and geophysical work.• Available for oil and gas leasing, subject to no surface occupancy.	<p>Tank Bench (2,646 acres) would be managed as a CSMA with the same as Alternative B except for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Hiking not limited to designated trails.• Available for watershed, range, wildlife habitat improvements and vegetation treatments.• Available for surface-disturbing land treatments if consistent with management plan objectives.• Available for locatable mineral entry, disposal of mineral materials, and geophysical work.• Available for oil and gas leasing, subject to standard lease terms.	<p>Tank Bench would not be managed as a CSMA. The area would be managed the same as adjacent areas with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Available for livestock use but may be limited if cultural resources are impacted.• Available for watershed, range, and wildlife habitat improvements.• Available for locatable mineral entry.• Available for disposal of mineral materials and geophysical work.• Available for oil and gas leasing, subject to standard lease terms.• Available for campfires.• Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products, including the on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.	<p>Tank Bench (2,646 acres) would be managed as a CSMA with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Hiking limited to designated trails.• Group size limited to 12 people.• Human waste must be packed out.• Closed to domestic pets and pack animals.• Closed to OHV use.• Available for livestock use but it may be limited if cultural resources are impacted.• Available for watershed, range, and wildlife habitat improvements.• Available for non–surface-disturbing vegetation treatments.• Closed to campfires.• Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products (including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires) with the exception of traditional cultural uses, as long as they do not adversely impact other resource values.• Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry, and unavailable for disposal of mineral materials and geophysical work.• Available for oil and gas leasing, subject to no surface occupancy.	<p>Tank Bench (2,646 acres) CSMA would become the Tank Bench SRMA. A selection of prescriptions from Alternatives A–E have been carried over into the SRMA. See Recreation section in this Chapter for prescriptions.</p>
Beef Basin Cultural Special Management Area (CSMA) (Map 2)					
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ALTERNATIVES					
The BLM would work with USFS and NPS to develop Interagency Recreation Commercial permits.					

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
No CSMA was identified in the 1991 San Juan Resource Area RMP, as amended. These lands are managed according to the 1991 San Juan RMP prescriptions.	<p>Beef Basin (20,302 acres) would be managed as a CSMA with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Management focus for the SRMA would be heritage, tourism, traditional cultural values, and scientific research of prehistoric cultural landscapes.• Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products (including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires).• Available for oil and gas leasing subject to timing limitations.• Available for livestock use, but may be limited if cultural resources are impacted.• Available for watershed, range, wildlife habitat improvements, and vegetation treatments.• OHV use limited to designated routes.• Development of a car campground in Ruin Park for primitive camping.• Designated primitive car camping areas in Middle Park, House Park, and along Beef Basin Loop Road, as well as other areas as necessary to control impacts to cultural resources.• Closure of all campsites that impact archaeological sites.• Cultural site visitation limited to designated trails.• Unavailable for campfires.• Group size limited to 12• Removal of human waste required.• Parking for day use limited to designated areas.• Car camping limited to designated camp areas and campgrounds with designated access routes and parking.• Climbing gear use allowed as an aid to hiking routes only. No fixed lines, bolts, chalk, etc. allowed in order to protect rock art.	<p>Beef Basin (20,302 acres) would be managed as an CSMA the same as in Alternative B, except for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Designated primitive car camping areas in Middle Park, House Park, and along Beef Basin Loop Road, as well as other areas as necessary to control impacts to cultural resources• Open for campfires; fire pan required.• Groups larger than 20 people total required to camp in designated areas and remove their waste.	<p>Beef Basin would not be managed as a CSMA. The area would be managed with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products, except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.• Available for oil and gas leasing subject to timing limitations.• Available for livestock use but may be limited if cultural resources are impacted.• Available for watershed, range, and wildlife habitat improvements, and vegetation treatments.• Designated primitive campsites outside of Ruin Park.• Development of a (seasonal) commercial campground in Ruin Park area.• Closure of all campsites that impact archaeological sites.• No group size limits.• Open for campfires; fire pan required.• Climbing gear allowed as an aid to hiking routes only. No fixed lines, bolts, chalk, etc. allowed.	<p>Beef Basin (20,302 acres) would be managed as a CSMA with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Management focus would be on heritage, tourism, traditional cultural values, and scientific research of prehistoric cultural landscapes.• Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products (including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires).• Available for disposal of mineral materials under special conditions and not recommended for withdrawal from entry.• Available for oil and gas leasing subject to timing limitations.• Available for geophysical work.• Available for livestock use but may be limited if cultural resources are impacted• No new improvements, maintenance of existing improvements allowed.• OHV use limited to designated routes and closed in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.• Development of a car campground in Ruin Park for primitive camping.• Designated primitive car camping within the interior of the Beef Basin Loop Road.• Closure of all campsites that impact archaeological sites or negatively impact wilderness characteristics.• Cultural site visitation limited to designated trails.• Closed to campfires.• Group size limited to 12 people total.• Removal of human waste required.• Parking for day use limited to designated areas.• Car camping limited to designated camp areas and campgrounds with designated	<p>Beef Basin CSMA (20,302 acres) would become the Beef Basin SRMA. A selection of prescriptions from Alternatives A–E have been carried over into the SRMA. See Recreation section in this Chapter for prescriptions.</p>

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

				access routes and parking. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Climbing gear use allowed as an aid to hiking routes only. No fixed lines, bolts, chalk, etc, allowed in order to protect rock art.	
McLoyd Canyon–Moon House Cultural Special Management Area (CSMA) (Map 2)					
McLoyd Canyon–Moon House is within a WSA; WSAs are managed under the IMP. The special management prescriptions below apply to Moon House for cultural protection.					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
No SRMA was identified in the 1991 San Juan Resource Area RMP, as amended. These lands are managed according to the 1991 San Juan RMP prescriptions.	<p>McLoyd Canyon–Moon House (1,607 acres) would be managed as a Management Zone (MZ) within Cedar Mesa SRMA with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Develop a cultural resource management plan (CRMP) for McLoyd Canyon–Moon House.• Public access limited via a permit system for day visits.• No more than 12 36 people allowed to visit Moon House per day. Limitations on visitation may change based on site monitoring of impacts of visitation.• One commercial group per day. Commercial trip numbers included in the day use number of 36.• Access to interior corridor limited to three people at any one time.• Visitors would not be allowed to enter the Moon Room and adjoining rooms.• Human waste must be packed out.• Designated primitive camp and park area west of the Snow Flat Road. Camping prohibited outside of this primitive camp area.• Hiking to Moon House site limited to designated trail.• Closed to pack animals and pets.• Closed to campfires.• Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products, including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.• McLoyd Canyon closed to overnight use from the head of the canyon to UTM: 607100E, 4143495N.	<p>Same as Alternative B except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Access to interior corridor limited to 4 people at any one time.	<p>Same as Alternative C except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 24 people would be allowed to visit Moon House per day. Limitations on visitation may change based on-site monitoring of impacts of visitation.• Two commercial groups per day allowed, but total number of visitors not to exceed more than 24 people per day.• Travel allowed on Road D4798, limited to the designated route.	<p>McLoyd Canyon–Moon House (1,607 acres) would be managed as a Management Zone (MZ) within Cedar Mesa SRMA with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Develop a CRMP for McLoyd Canyon–Moon House.• Public access limited via a permit system for day visits.• No more than 12 people would be allowed to visit Moon House/day. Limitations on visitation may change based on site monitoring of impacts of visitation.• One commercial group per day.• Access to interior corridor limited to three people at any one time.• Visitors would not be allowed to enter the Moon Room and adjoining rooms.• Human waste must be packed out.• Designated primitive camp and park area west of the Snow Flat Road. Camping prohibited outside of this primitive camp area.• Hiking to Moon House site limited to designated trail.• Closed to pack animals and pets.• Closed to campfires.• Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products, including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.• McLoyd Canyon closed to overnight use from the head of the canyon to UTM: 607100E, 4143495N.• Utah State Section Township 39S Range 19E, Section 2 to be acquired.	McLoyd Canyon–Moon House (1,607 acres) would become a recreation management zone within the Cedar Mesa SRMA. See Recreation section in this chapter for prescriptions.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Utah State Section Township 39S Range 19E, Section 2 to be acquired.• Development of a site stewardship program to monitor site and possibly develop guided tours.			<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Development of a site stewardship program to monitor site and possibly develop guided tours.	
Grand Gulch National Historic District Grand Gulch National Historic District is within a WSA; WSAs are managed under the IMP. The special management prescriptions below apply to Grand Gulch National Historic District for cultural protection.					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
<p>Grand Gulch Special Emphasis Area/Grand Gulch National Historic District (37,433 acres) would be managed for Cultural and Recreational values (natural values associated with primitive recreation/scenic):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Unavailable for mineral leasing in Grand Gulch Special Emphasis area.• Available for geophysical work except Grand Gulch Special Emphasis area.• Closed to disposal of mineral materials.• Retained in public ownership and classified as segregated from entry (a Secretarial withdrawal would be requested).• Excluded from private ownership and commercial use of woodland products, except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.• Available for livestock use, except Grand Gulch Canyon and associated tributaries, below Kane Gulch fence to the confluence with the San Juan River (approximately 16,599 acres).• Closed to OHV use.• Managed as VRM Class I.• Excluded from surface disturbance by mechanized or motorized equipment.• Managed for Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) Primitive (P)-class to provide primitive recreation opportunities in the ROS areas.• ROS P-class areas protected from surface disturbance to the	<p>Grand Gulch National Historic District (37,388 acres) would be managed with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Unavailable for oil and gas leasing• Unavailable for geophysical activities.• Unavailable for disposal of mineral materials.• Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.• Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products, except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. Campfires limited to mesa tops only (no campfires in the canyon).• Available for livestock use, except Grand Gulch Canyon and associated tributaries, below Kane Gulch fence to the confluence with the San Juan River (approximately 16,316 acres).• Closed to OHV use.• Excluded from surface disturbance by mechanized or motorized equipment.• Excluded from habitat improvements, watershed improvements, and vegetation treatments. Exceptions are nonmotorized weed control with no surface disturbance.• Designate trails and camping areas as necessary to protect cultural resources.• Closed to pack animals and pets.• Human waste must be packed out.	<p>Grand Gulch National Historic District (37,388 acres) would be managed the same as Alternative B except for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Nonmotorized habitat improvements, watershed improvements, vegetation treatments, including aerial seeding, hand reseeding, planting seedlings, and control of invasive non-native species allowed as long as they do not impact cultural resources based on a site-specific analysis, and are consistent with the IMP.• Limitations on numbers of trips may be implemented if cultural resources are impacted.• Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.	<p>Grand Gulch National Historic District (37,388 acres) would be managed the same as Alternative C with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO.• Available for geophysical exploration that meets definition of "casual use" as defined 43 CFR 3150.• Pets and pack animals allowed.	<p>Grand Gulch National Historic District (37,388 acres) would be managed as prescribed by the IMP and with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Unavailable to oil and gas leasing.• Unavailable for geophysical activities.• Unavailable for disposal of mineral materials.• Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.• Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products, except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. Campfires limited to mesa tops only (no campfires in the canyon).• Available for livestock use, except Grand Gulch Canyon and associated tributaries, below Kane Gulch fence to the confluence with the San Juan River (approximately 16,316 acres).• Closed to OHV use.• Excluded from surface disturbance by mechanized or motorized equipment.• Excluded from habitat improvements, watershed improvements, and vegetation treatments. Exceptions are nonmotorized weed control with no surface disturbance.• Designated trails and camping areas as necessary to protect cultural resources.• Closed to pack animals and pets.• Human waste must be packed out.	<p>Grand Gulch NHD (37,388 acres) would be become a recreation management zone within the Cedar Mesa SRMA. See Recreation section in this chapter for prescriptions.</p>

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

maximum extent possible. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Open to leasing with NSO in ROS P-class areas.• Managed to limit recreation use if cultural resources or scenic values are being damaged.• Subject to conditional fire suppression with motorized suppression methods used only if necessary to protect life or property.					
FIRE MANAGEMENT					
<p>Fire management would adopt the comprehensive Utah Land Use Plan Amendment for Fire and Fuels Management, September 2005 (LUP Amendment; BLM 2005c). This document may be found at www.ut.blm.gov/fireplanning/index/htm. Direction and guidance approved by the LUP Amendment is incorporated by reference into this RMP. Refer to Map 3, which identifies the Fire Management Areas. Specific decisions for other resources that could impact fire management are found throughout this table. However, the content and purpose of the LUP Amendment is adopted and is summarized as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Establishes landscape-level fire management goals and objectives.• Describes Desired Wildland Fire Conditions (DWFC) and the management strategies and actions to meet DWFC goals.• Describes areas where fire may be restored to the ecosystem through wildland fire use for resource benefit and areas where wildland fire use is not appropriate.• Identifies Resource Protection Measures (RPMs) for fire management practices to protect natural and cultural resource values.• Identifies criteria used to establish fire management priorities. <p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ALTERNATIVES</p> <p>Firefighter and public safety are the primary goals in all fire management decisions and actions.</p> <p>Appendix B, Desired Wildland Fire Condition and Condition Class, shows the different responses allowed for the planning area (PA).</p> <p>Wildland fire would be utilized to protect, maintain and enhance resources and, when possible, would be allowed to function in its natural ecological role.</p> <p>Hazardous fuels reduction treatments would be used to restore ecosystems; protect human, natural and cultural resources; and reduce the threat of wildfire to communities.</p> <p>Fires would be suppressed at minimum cost, taking into account firefighter and public safety as well as benefits and values to be protected that are consistent with resource objectives.</p> <p>The BLM would implement a consistent, safe, and cost-effective fire management program through appropriate planning, staffing, training, and equipment.</p> <p>Fire management objectives would be established for every area with burnable vegetation, based on sound science and consideration of other resource objectives.</p> <p>Emergency stabilization, rehabilitation, and restoration efforts would be implemented to protect and sustain resources, public health and safety, and community infrastructure.</p> <p>The BLM would work together with partners and other impacted groups and individuals to reduce risks to communities and to restore ecosystems.</p> <p>The Reasonable and Prudent Measures and Terms and Conditions identified in consultation with the USFWS for the LUP Amendment would be implemented in fire-related actions.</p> <p>The BLM would work together with Native Americans to provide for their use of woodland products as associated with fire, fuels, and emergency stabilization and rehabilitation (ES&R) actions.</p> <p><u>Criteria for Establishing Fire Management Priorities</u></p> <p>Protection of human life is the primary fire management priority. Establishing a priority among protecting human communities and community infrastructure, other property and improvements, and natural and cultural resources is based on human health and safety, the values to be protected, and the costs of protection. When firefighters and other personnel have been committed to an incident, these human resources become the highest values to be protected. Priorities for all aspects of fire management decisions and actions are based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Protection of the Wildland-Urban Interface (WUI) (including At-Risk Communities and At-Risk Watersheds)• Maintaining existing healthy ecosystems• High priority subbasins or watersheds• Threatened, endangered, or special status species• Cultural resources and/or cultural landscapes <p><u>Suppression</u></p> <p>An Appropriate Management Response (AMR) procedure is required for every wildland fire that is not a prescribed fire. In all fire management decisions, strategies, and actions, firefighter and public safety are the highest priority followed by consideration of benefits and values to be protected as well as suppression costs. The AMR can range from full suppression to managing fire for resource benefit (wildland fire use). Resource goals and objectives outlined in the RMP guide the development and implementation of AMR fire management activities in regard to the accomplishment of those objectives. The FMP establishes fire suppression objectives with minimum and maximum suppression targets for each Fire Management Unit (FMU) within the PA. While firefighter and public safety are the first priority, considerations for suppression activities also include fire intensity, acreage, and spread potential; threats to life and property; potential to impact high-value resources such as critical habitat for threatened, endangered, and sensitive species; crucial wildlife habitat; cultural resources and/or riparian areas; historic fire regimes; and other special considerations such as wilderness and/or adjacent agency lands.</p> <p><u>Wildland Fire Use for Resource Benefit</u></p> <p>Wildland fire is authorized as a tool, when appropriate, to allow naturally ignited wildland fire to accomplish specific resource management objectives. Due to existing resource conditions and proximity to values at risk, fire cannot be allowed to resume its natural role on all BLM lands in the FO. Consideration of ongoing management decisions and other natural changes would direct periodical reassessment of DWFC and determination of potential areas for wildland fire use. Operational management of wildland fire use is</p>					

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

<p>described in the Wildland Fire Implementation Plan (WFIP).</p> <p>The FMP identifies FMUs that may have the potential for wildland fire use. Wildland fire use may be authorized for all areas, except when the following resources and values may be negatively impacted and there are no reasonable Resource Protection Measures to protect such resources and values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• WUI areas• Areas known to be highly susceptible to post-fire cheatgrass or invasive weed invasion• Important terrestrial and aquatic habitats• Non–fire-adapted vegetation communities• Sensitive cultural resources• Areas of soil with high or very high erosion hazard• Class I areas and PM10 nonattainment areas• Administrative sites• Developed recreation sites• Communication sites• Oil, gas, and mining facilities• Aboveground utility corridors• High-use travel corridors, such as interstates, railroads, and/or highways <p><u>Fuels Treatment</u></p> <p>Fuels management activities outlined in the FMP would be consistent with the resource goals and objectives contained in the RMP. To reduce hazards and to restore ecosystems, authorized fuels management decisions include wildland fire use, prescribed fire, and mechanical, manual, chemical, biological, and seeding treatments. The FMP describes fuels management goals and objectives, and the full range of fuels management strategies and actions authorized for fuels reduction. Fuels treatments are focused on the DWFC of restoring historic fire regimes to ecosystems when feasible, so that future wildland fire use actions can be more easily implemented.</p> <p>Fuels management decisions may include but are not limited to the following activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mechanical treatments such as mowing, chopping, or chipping/grinding (brush cutter), chaining, tilling, or cutting• Manual treatments such as handcutting (chainsaw or handsaw) and handpiling• Prescribed fire, including broadcast, underburn, and handpile burning• Chemical spraying or biological treatments such as insects or goats/sheep• Seeding including aerial or ground application (manual or mechanical) <p>Targeted areas may be treated in phases over a period of several years and may involve multiple and varied treatments. Estimated fuels reduction treatments of 5,000 to 10,000 acres/year are targeted dependent on budgetary and time constraints.</p> <p>Implementation of fuels management decisions would be prioritized using the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• WUI areas• Areas with fuel loading that could potentially result in the loss of ecosystem components following wildland fire• Resource management goals and objectives <p><u>Prevention and Mitigation</u></p> <p>Prevention and mitigation goals target a reduction in unauthorized wildland fire ignitions. Goals include coordination with partners and affected groups and individuals, and a wide range of prevention and mitigation activities such as personal contacts, mass media, signing, and defensible space education.</p> <p>Implementation of fire prevention activities would be prioritized using the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• WUI areas• Major travel corridors• Recreation sites• Public lands as a whole <p><u>Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation (ES&R)</u></p> <p>A Normal Year Fire Stabilization and Rehabilitation Plan (NFRP) is in place to meet ES&R needs and to comply with up-to-date ES&R policy and guidance. The NFRP is a programmatic implementation plan authorizing treatment options specific to vegetative communities and dependent upon post-wildland fire conditions and other site-specific considerations. Treatment actions that are designed according to the type and severity of wildfire impacts and priorities include but are not limited to areas where the following criteria apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• It is necessary to protect human life and safety as well as property.• Unique or critical cultural and/or historical resources are at risk.• It is determined soils are highly susceptible to accelerated erosion.• Perennial grasses and forbs (fire-tolerant plants) are not expected to provide soil and watershed protection within two years.
--

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is a need to establish a vegetative fuel break of less flammable species (greenstrips).• Unacceptable vegetation, such as noxious weeds, may readily invade and become established.• Shrubs and forbs are a crucial habitat component for wintering mule deer, antelope, sage-grouse, or other special status species.• Stabilization and rehabilitation are necessary to meet RMP resource objectives, including rangeland seedings.• It is necessary to protect water quality.• It is necessary to quickly restore threatened, endangered, or special status species habitat populations to prevent negative impacts. <p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ACTION ALTERNATIVES</p> <p>Fire suppression on non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be through light on the land techniques.</p> <p>The Moab Fire District Fire Management Plan (FMP) would be updated and amended to meet the direction and objectives of the RMP.</p>
HEALTH AND SAFETY
<p>GOALS AND OBJECTIVES</p> <p>Effectively manage hazardous risks on public lands to protect the health and safety of public land users and stewards; protect the natural and environmental resources; minimize future hazardous and related risks, costs, and liabilities; and mitigate physical hazards in compliance with all applicable laws, regulations, and policies.</p>
<p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ALTERNATIVES</p> <p><u>Human Health and Safety</u></p> <p>The BLM would strive to ensure that human health and safety concerns on the public lands it manages are appropriately mitigated if determined hazardous.</p> <p><u>Abandoned Mine Lands</u></p> <p>In conformance with the BLM's long-term strategies and National Policies regarding Abandoned Mine Lands (AMLs), this RMP recognizes the need to work with our partners toward identifying and addressing physical safety and environmental hazards at all AML sites on public lands. In order to achieve this goal, a state strategy has been written. National program criteria for determining site priorities were used to develop the work plan. This state strategy is entitled "Utah Abandoned Mine Land Multi -Year Work Plan." The following criteria would be established to assist in determining priorities for site and area mitigation and reclamation.</p> <p>AML physical safety program priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Highest priority would be cleaning up AML sites where (a) a death or injury has occurred, (b) the site is situated on or in immediate proximity to developed recreation sites and areas with high visitor use, or (c) upon formal risk assessment, a high or extremely high risk level is indicated;• AML would be factored into future recreation management area designations, land-use planning assessments, and all applicable use authorizations;• The site is presently listed or is eligible for listing in the Abandoned Mines and Site Cleanup Module;• AML hazards should be, to the extent practicable, mitigated or remediated on the ground during site development.• AML water-quality program priorities are ones where the state has identified the watershed as a priority based on 1) one or more water laws or regulations; 2) threat to public health or safety; 3) threat to the environment; 4) the project reflects a collaborative effort with other land managing agencies; 5) the site is presently listed or is eligible for listing in the Abandoned Mines and Site Cleanup Module; and 6) the project would be funded by contributions from collaborating agencies. <p>These priorities would be maintained and updated as needed in the state AML strategy.</p> <p>The BLM would identify and clean up unauthorized dumping and shooting areas in the PA as required to comply with applicable state, local, and federal regulations. These would include areas such as the unauthorized shooting range west of Blanding, dumps near Hovenweep, the Monticello Airport, and Paiute Knoll.</p> <p><u>Hazardous Materials</u></p> <p>Use, transportation, storage and disposal of hazardous materials shall comply with the applicable Federal and State laws. Use of pesticides and herbicides shall be used only in accordance with their registered uses and within limitations imposed by the Secretary of the Interior.</p> <p><u>Hazardous Waste</u></p> <p>The BLM would respond to releases as appropriate.</p>
LANDS AND REALTY
<p>GOALS AND OBJECTIVES</p> <p>The BLM would retain lands within its administration except where necessary to accomplish resource goals and objectives outlined in the plan. The BLM would transfer lands out of federal ownership or acquire non-federal lands or conservation easements where needed to accomplish resource goals and objectives, improve administration of public lands, or to meet essential community needs.</p> <p>Make public land available for a variety of ROWs, alternative energy sources, and permits where consistent with resource, goals, objectives, and prescriptions.</p>
<p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ALTERNATIVES</p> <p>The BLM would not transfer out of federal ownership any habitat for listed threatened or endangered species or any habitat for non-listed special status species if it could be determined that such an action would lead to the need to list any species as threatened or endangered. Acquisition of potential/occupied special status species habitat would be high priority. These acquired/exchanged lands would be managed according to BLM land management prescriptions for special status species.</p> <p>Under IMP and Congressional action, WSAs and Wilderness Areas would be exclusion areas for any ROWs (Section 501[a] FLPMA).</p> <p><u>Land Tenure Adjustments</u></p>

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

<p>Lands would be considered for disposal or acquisition if the changes are in accordance with resource management objectives and other RMP decisions, and would meet one or more of the following criteria as outlined by BLM Land Tenure Adjustment criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Such changes are determined to be in the public interest and would accommodate the needs of local and state governments, including needs for the economy, public purposes, and community growth.• Such changes would result in a net gain of important and manageable resources on public lands such as crucial wildlife habitat, important cultural sites, quality riparian areas, live water, listed species habitat, or areas key to productive ecosystems.• Such changes would ensure public access to lands in areas where access is needed and cannot otherwise be obtained.• Such changes would promote effective management and meet essential resource objectives through land ownership consolidation.• Such changes would result in acquisition of lands that serve regional or national priorities identified in applicable policy directives.• Such changes have been identified in existing activity plans (i.e., habitat management plans, etc.). <p>Acquisitions would be managed in the same manner as adjoining lands unless they are acquired for a specific purpose (i.e., wildlife habitat, buffer zones near other federal lands, etc.).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A priority section for acquisition would be Utah State Section Township 39S Range 19E, Section 2, to acquire culturally sensitive lands in the McLoyd Canyon–Moon House area. <p>Give land exchanges with the State of Utah priority consideration to resolve in-holdings issues. The BLM would recognize the mission, goals, and objectives of the State of Utah as they relate to the values and resources of state-owned lands. The Monticello FO would work cooperatively with the State of Utah in identifying opportunities for Land Tenure Agreements (LTAs) that may assist the state in furthering its mission. These agreements must comply with applicable law and policy; consider fair market values; consider LTA criteria; and comply with goals and objectives for resource management prescribed in the RMP. They would be processed on a case-by-case basis, with consideration given to the goals, objectives, and decisions of this RMP.</p> <p>Filming Permits</p> <p>Applications for filming permits in the Monticello PA would be limited to existing highways, roads, and pullouts and previously disturbed or cleared areas throughout the Field Office (including Valley of the Gods, Moki Dugway, Highway 211, Newspaper Rock, and Highway 95) and would have to meet the following criteria of minimal impact to be approved without any NEPA analysis. Filming projects that do not meet these criteria would be subject to site-specific NEPA analysis prior to permit approval or use of programmatic NEPA documents including EAs, on BLM-managed lands in Utah within WSAs (EA USO-06-004), or other programmatic NEPA documents that may be developed on a local, state or bureau basis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Project would not impact sensitive habitat or species.• Project would not impact cultural resources or Native American sacred sites.• Project would not involve use of pyrotechnics.• Project would not involve more than minimum impacts to land, air, or water. (Minimum is defined as temporary impact only; no permanent impacts; no surface disturbance allowed that can't be raked out or rehabbed so that there is no sign of activity at the end of the filming).• Project would not involve use of explosives.• Project would not involve use of exotic plant or animal species that could cause danger of introduction into the area.• Project would not involve WSAs, non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, WSR corridors, National Register Eligible Sites, and Native American Sacred Sites.• Project would not involve adverse impacts to sensitive surface resource values including: historic, cultural or paleontological sites; sensitive soils; relict environments; wetlands or riparian areas; ACECs.• Project does not involve substantial restriction of public access.• Project does not involve substantial use of domestic livestock.• Project does not involve 15 or more production vehicles within sensitive area.• Project does not involve 75 or more people within sensitive area.• The activity within the sensitive area would not continue in excess of 10 days.• No refueling allowed within sensitive areas.• Aircraft use in area with wildlife concerns is not proposed during crucial wildlife period for more than 1 day and does not exceed frequency of 2 projects per 30-day period.• Aircraft use in area with no wildlife concerns is proposed for no more than 2 days and does not exceed frequency of 3 projects per 30-day period.• Use of aircraft is not proposed within 0.5 mile of a designated campground located within a sensitive area and the number of low-elevation passes would not exceed 4 passes per day. <p>Recreation and Public Purpose Act (R&PP) and Other Authorizations for Disposal</p> <p>Lands conveyed to state or local governments or non-profit organizations under the R&PP Act may include those identified in LTAs. In addition, requests for lands other than those identified could be considered for disposal provided the proposed use would provide a greater public benefit than that which the current management provides, and that the action is otherwise consistent with this RMP. Examples may include but are not limited to local government or non-profit recreational and public purposes facilities such as public shooting ranges, landfills, motocross tracks, racetracks, etc. Other authorizations for disposal include the Airport and Airway Improvement Act, state selections under the Enabling Act, and other authorities.</p> <p>Trespass Resolution</p> <p>Resolution of intentional trespass would be limited to removal and/or restoration as appropriate. Resolution of unintentional trespass may include authorization under ROW grant, commercial/agricultural lease, or permit; disposal of the impacted land through sale or exchange; or removal, depending on the nature of the trespass. In all such trespass cases, administrative costs incurred by the BLM for investigating and resolving trespasses would be collected. All trespass incidents resolved by issuance of ROW grants, leases, or permits would be subject to payment by the holder/lessee/permittee of rent based on market value. Trespass cases resolved by land sales would be based on fair market value, and land exchanges would be completed on an equal value basis.</p> <p>Access</p> <p>ROWs for state and private in-holdings, in-field oil and gas leases, and pipelines for producing oil and gas wells would be approved subject to a determination of "reasonable" access for the "intended purpose" and they are processed and issued upon application. As per the State of Utah v. Andrus, October 1, 1979 (Cotter Decision), the BLM would grant the State of Utah reasonable access to state lands for economic purposes, on a case by case basis.</p> <p>Easements</p> <p>Easements would be acquired from willing landowners and the State of Utah to gain access to public lands or placement of facilities on non-public lands, and acquire easements to accomplish resource objectives.</p> <p>Rights-of-ways</p> <p>Right-of-way (ROW) avoidance and exclusion areas would generally be consistent with the stipulations identified in Appendix A for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities. These stipulations have been developed to protect important resource</p>

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

<p>values. Areas identified as NSO are open to oil and gas leasing but surface-disturbing activities cannot be conducted on the surface of the land. Access to oil and gas deposits would require directional drilling from outside the boundaries of the NSO areas. NSO areas are avoidance areas for ROWs; no ROW would be granted in NSO areas unless there are no feasible alternatives.</p> <p>Applications for new ROW on public lands would be considered and analyzed on a case-by-case basis, taking into consideration areas identified for avoidance and exclusion. Proposals would be reviewed for consistency with planning decisions and evaluated under requirements of applicable laws for resource protection.</p> <p>Wind and Solar Development</p> <p>ROW applications for wind or solar energy development would incorporate best management practices (BMPs) and provisions contained in the Wind Energy or Solar Programmatic EIS documents Both wind and solar energy development are authorized by ROW grants.</p> <p>Sale Disposal Criteria</p> <p>As described under Sections 203 (a) of FLPMA (43 United States Code [U.S.C.] 1713; 1716), public lands have potential for disposal by sale when they are isolated and/or difficult to manage.</p> <p>Sale or other disposals, approximately 6,580 acres of land, are identified for disposal by legal description in Appendix C (Lands and Realty, Tracts Identified for Disposal) These lands need to be screened on a case by case basis to assure that they meet FLPMA 203 criteria.</p> <p>Transportation and Utility Corridors</p> <p>This RMP would adopt the existing designated ROW corridors including the Western Utility Group (WUG) updates to the Western Regional Corridor Study (Map 4 and Section 368 Energy Policy Act of 2005 West-Wide Energy Corridor), and would designate additional corridors subject to physical barriers and sensitive resource values. Designated transportation and utility corridors include existing groupings of ROWs for electric transmission facilities, pipelines 16 inches and larger, communication lines, federal and state highways, and major county road systems.</p>					
Rights-of-way (ROW)					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
<p>Lands available for ROWs are divided into four categories according to the 1991 San Juan RMP prescriptions (page 37):</p> <p>1) Lands within designated transportation and utility corridors,</p> <p>2) lands outside designated transportation and utility corridors,</p> <p>3) lands to be avoided, and</p> <p>4) lands to be excluded.</p> <p>Avoidance Areas: 120,800 acres</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cedar Mesa ACEC• Portion of Grand Gulch• Dark Canyon ACEC• ROS SPM area of San Juan River SRMA• Developed Recreation Sites <p>Exclusion Areas: 253,790 acres</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Alkali Ridge ACEC• Bridger Jack Mesa ACEC• Butler Wash ACEC• Cedar Mesa ACEC, partial• Hovenweep ACEC• Indian Creek ACEC• Lavender Mesa ACEC• Pearson Canyon Hiking Area• Scenic Highway Corridor ACEC• Shay Canyon ACEC• Most ROS P-class areas	<p>Consider lands available for ROWs except for :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Avoidance Areas: 125,105 acres.• Exclusion Areas: 416,612 acres.	<p>Consider lands available for ROWs except for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Avoidance Areas: 39,323 acres.• Exclusion Areas: 395,329 acres.	<p>Consider lands available for ROWs except for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Avoidance Areas: 14,175 acres.• Exclusion Areas: 386,853 acres.	<p>Consider lands available for ROWs except for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Avoidance Areas: 53,915 acres.• Exclusion Areas: 974,463 acres.	<p>Consider lands available for ROWs except for (Map 94):</p> <p>Avoidance Areas: 133,293 acres</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Indian Creek ACEC (3,908 acres)• Shay Canyon ACEC (119 acres)• Lavender Mesa ACEC (649 acres)• Hovenweep ACEC (880-acre Visual Emphasis Zone)• Alkali Ridge National Historic Landmark (2,146)• non-WSA with wilderness characteristics 88, 871 acres: (Dark Canyon, Nokai Dome East, Nokai Dome West, Grand Gulch, and Mancos Mesa),• Comb Ridge Recreation Management Zone of Cedar Mesa SRMA (30,752 acres)• San Juan River SRMA Segments 1, 2, and 3• Colorado River Segment 2• developed recreation sites• floodplains• riparian areas and springs• public water reserves. <p>Exclusion Areas: 393,252 acres</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• WSAs 389,444 acres (Mancos Mesa, Grand Gulch ISA Complex, Road Canyon, Fish Creek Canyon, Mule Canyon, Cheesebox Canyon, Dark Canyon ISA Complex, Butler Wash, Bridger Jack Mesa, Indian Creek, South Needles, Squaw and Papoose Canyons, and Cross Canyon• Lands administratively endorsed for wilderness by Butler Wash North WSA• Valley of the Gods ACEC (22,863 acres)• San Juan River Segment 5• Colorado River Segment 3
Withdrawal Processing and Review					
General Management Guidance					

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

FLPMA requires the BLM to review agency withdrawals and prior Classification and Multiple Use Act (C&MU) classifications according to schedules prepared by USO or upon special BLM or agency request. The Monticello FO would review other-agency withdrawals (24,140 acres); withdrawals found to be obsolete can be removed. New withdrawals are processed upon request from the BLM or other federal agencies, but can be made only by the Secretary or by Congress. Support Support from Utah State Office and Washington Office would be needed for requests for withdrawal. Interdisciplinary staff support would be needed for coordination and development of site-specific mitigation. Coordination with surface owners, surface-administering agencies, or the State of Utah may also be required. Coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service would be required where threatened or endangered species are involved.					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Withdraw 132,380 acres (Map 5) from locatable mineral entry as listed below. Review existing withdrawals and remove unnecessary ones. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• C&MU classification (prior to RMP) (92,130 acres)• Acquired lands (9,730 acres)• Lands open prior to the RMP (30,520 acres)	Areas recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry (251,710 acres) (Map 6): <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Tank Bench (2,646 acres)• Comb Ridge (42,428 acres)• Grand Gulch NHD (37,388 acres)• All developed recreation sites (232 acres)• San Juan River SRMA (10,203 acres)• Alkali Ridge NHL (2,146 acres)• Valley of Gods ACEC (22,863 acres)• Colorado River Segment 3 (1,040 acres)• Dark Canyon River Segment (2,048 acres)• Dark Canyon ACEC (61,660 acres)• Indian Creek ACEC (3,908 acres)• Lockhart Basin ACEC (47,783 acres)• Butler Wash North ACEC (17,365 acres)	Areas recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry (121,912 acres) (Map 7): <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Comb Ridge (42,428 acres)• Grand Gulch NHD (37,388 acres)• All developed recreation sites (232 acres)• San Juan River SRMA (9,859 acres)• Alkali Ridge NHL (2,146 acres)• Valley of Gods ACEC (22,863 acres)• Colorado River Segment 3 (1,040 acres)• Dark Canyon River Segment (2,048 acres)• Indian Creek ACEC (3,908 acres)	Areas recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry (46,131 acres) (Map 8): <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Grand Gulch NHD (37,388 acres)• All developed recreation sites (232 acres)• San Juan River SRMA (6,365 acres)• Alkali Ridge NHL (2,146 acres)	Same as Alternative B except that all non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (834,070 acres) (Map 9) would be recommended for withdrawal.	Areas recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry (50,665 acres) (Map 10): <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Grand Gulch National Historic District (37,388 acres)• All developed recreation sites (232 acres)• San Juan River SRMA (9,859 acres)• Alkali Ridge National Historic Landmark (2,146 acres)• Colorado River Segment 3 (1,040 acres)
LIVESTOCK GRAZING					
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES					
Achieve Rangeland Health Standards (BLM 1997) and other desired resource conditions.					
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ALTERNATIVES					
Manage grazing according to Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management (BLM 1997) (Appendix D). Maintain lands currently unavailable (128,098 acres) for livestock grazing (due to vegetation, recreation, wildlife, or other concerns). Maintain existing land treatments as prioritized in Appendix D, to meet RMP objectives and Standards for Rangeland Health (BLM 1997). Any new land treatments developed in addition to those listed would also be maintained as necessary to meet RMP objectives and Standards for Rangeland Health. Modify and implement existing (Tank Draw and East Canyon) and new Allotment Management Plans (AMPs) as necessary to meet RMP objectives and Standards for Rangeland Health (BLM 1997). Develop and implement 29 new AMPs and others identified on a site-specific basis, for which resource concerns develop that require such action. Continue to authorize current active permitted grazing use unless monitoring data or other factors indicate a need for change (e.g., change in federal land ownership, etc.). Continue to categorize allotments in accordance with BLM policy. Manage allotments towards mid- to late-seral ecological condition that meet other goals and objectives of this RMP until replaced by a more specific allotment objective classification such as Desired Future Condition (DFC).					
Forage, Livestock/Wildlife Coordinate with UDWR and grazing permittees to manage for long-term forage and habitat and/or ecological condition requirements or needs for livestock and wildlife, consistent with grazing allotment and herd management unit objectives.					
Seasons of Use Changes in livestock season of use would be made by the FO on an allotment-specific basis to meet RMP objectives or Standards for Rangeland Health (BLM 1997), as shown by monitoring data, and to provide flexibility in management of livestock grazing.					

<p><i>*Allotment seasons of use, subject to the statement above, would be the same as in the current RMP (see Appendix D Livestock Grazing) with the following exceptions noted in Management Common to All Action Alternatives below.¹</i></p> <p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ACTION ALTERNATIVES</p> <p><u>*Season of Use Changes (modified to match grazing permits as currently authorized, yet altered from the 1991 San Juan RMP):¹</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Church Rock season of use would end May 31.¹ • Indian Rock season of use would end April 15.¹ • Owens Dugout season of use would end April 30.¹ • Laws season of use would be April 16–November 15.¹ • Bear Trap Season of use would be September 1–December 12.¹ • Monument Canyon season of use would be December 1–May 31.¹ <p><u>*New Allotments—Established Since 1991 San Juan RMP (grazing permits as currently authorized):¹</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Vega season of use would be January 6–February 28.¹ • Upper Mail Station season of use would be November 14–February 28.¹ • Big Westwater season of use would be April 1–May 31 or October 15–December 15.¹ <p><u>Glen Canyon NRA</u></p> <p>Specific management direction for livestock grazing is provided for under the Glen Canyon NRA 1999 Grazing Management Plan.</p> <p><u>Areas Unavailable for Grazing</u></p> <p>Areas made unavailable for grazing may be reconsidered as available for grazing during subsequent revision or amendment of the RMP.</p> <p><u>Utilization</u></p> <p>Desired utilization levels as management guidelines for key forage species would be identified as needed to monitor use levels on an allotment specific basis to achieve Desired Future Condition (DFC). Where utilization levels have not been established, a use level of 50% would be the management guideline. Utilization is the proportion or degree of current year's forage production that is consumed or removed by animals (including insects). Utilization data should be analyzed in conjunction with climate, actual grazing use, current or historic impacts (wildfire, livestock, wildlife, insects, etc.), and long-term trend data to help evaluate existing and design future management to meet LUP objectives.</p> <p><u>Relinquishment of Preference</u></p> <p>Voluntary relinquishments of grazing permits and preference, in whole or in part, by a permittee in writing to the BLM will be handled on a case by case basis. The BLM will not recognize relinquishments that are conditional on specific BLM actions as valid, and the BLM will not be bound by them. Relinquished permits and the associated preference will remain available for application by qualified applicants after BLM considers if such action would meet rangeland health standards and is compatible with achieving LUP goals and objectives. Prior to re-issuance of the relinquished permit the terms and conditions may be modified to meet LUP goals and objectives and/or site-specific resource objectives.</p> <p>However, upon relinquishment, BLM may determine through a site-specific evaluation and associated NEPA analysis that the public lands involved are better used for other purposes. Grazing may then be discontinued on the allotment through an amendment to the existing LUP or a new LUP effort. Any decision issued concerning discontinuance of livestock grazing is not permanent and may be reconsidered and changed through future LUP amendments and updates.</p>					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
<p>Continue to make unavailable for grazing 128,098 acres as follows (Map 12):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comb Wash side canyons (Mule Canyon south of U-95, Arch, Fish, Owl, and Road). These areas were made unavailable to grazing by court decision and are also made unavailable to grazing in this RMP revision. • Bridger Jack Mesa (near relict vegetation) • Grand Gulch area (within the canyon) of Cedar Mesa 	<p>Same as Alternative A with the additional following areas made unavailable to grazing (Map 13):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slickhorn Canyon (Perkins Brother's Allotment) • Rone Bailey Mesa (Upper Mail Station Allotment) • Dodge Canyon Allotment • Mule Canyon (including North and South Forks north of U-95) • Rogers Allotment • Portions of West Butler Wash Canyons • Horsehead Canyon within 	<p>Same as Alternative B except for Mule Canyon, which would be made unavailable for grazing south of U-95 (North and South Forks north of U-95 would be open) (Map 14).</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A with the additional following areas made unavailable for grazing (Map 15):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slickhorn Canyon (within Perkins Brother's Allotment) • Rone Bailey Mesa (within Upper Mail Station Allotment) • Mule Canyon south of U-95 • Rogers Allotment • Portions of West Butler Wash Canyons <p>Grazing in the riparian area of the San Juan River SRMA would be restricted to October 1–May 31 and must meet or exceed PFC, and</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A with the additional following areas made unavailable for grazing (Map 13):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slickhorn Canyon (within Perkins Brother's Allotment) • Rone Bailey Mesa (within Upper Mail Station Allotment) • Dodge Canyon Allotment • Mule Canyon (including North and South Forks north of U-95) • Rogers Allotment • Portions of West Butler Wash Canyons • Horsehead Canyon (within 	<p>Continue to make unavailable for grazing 134,277 acres. as follows (Map 16):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comb Wash side canyons (Mule Canyon south of U-95, Arch, Fish, Owl, and Road). These areas were made unavailable to grazing by court decision and are also made unavailable to grazing in this RMP revision. • Bridger Jack Mesa (near relict vegetation) • Grand Gulch area (within the canyon) of Cedar Mesa • Lavender Mesa (relict vegetation) • Five identified mesa tops (White Canyon area) • Pearson Canyon (hiking area boundary) • Developed recreation sites (currently developed and proposed and listed in the recreation section. Any sites additional to those listed may be unavailable for grazing

² This is an implementation-level decision that cannot be protested under the planning regulations. Please see the cover letter for further information.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lavender Mesa (relict vegetation)• Five identified mesa tops (White Canyon area)• Pearson Canyon (hiking area boundary)• Developed recreation sites (currently developed and proposed and listed in the recreation section. Any sites additional to those listed may be unavailable for grazing without a plan amendment and would be analyzed with site-specific NEPA).• Parts of the slopes of Peter's Canyon and East Canyon (15,720 acres of wildlife habitat).• Dark Canyon Area, with the exception of 962 acres in Fable Valley that is limited to trailing on an annual basis and grazing use under emergency conditions.	<p>Montezuma Canyon allotment</p> <p>Harts Canyon, Shay Canyon ACEC, and Indian Creek from Kelly Ranch vicinity to USFS boundary would be restricted to livestock trailing only, no grazing, as stipulated as a Term and Condition on the pertinent grazing permit. Moki Canyon and Lake Canyon would be restricted to trailing only except in the spring and fall for up to 1 to 2 weeks to gather livestock prior to moving to and from these areas.</p> <p>The BLM would develop seasonal restrictions, closures, and/or forage utilization limits on grazing in riparian areas deemed Functioning at Risk and/or Non-functional.</p> <p>Moki Canyon is open to grazing above the fence (northeast) at Harrison Spring and below the fence (southwest) downstream where the sand slide and road join Moki Canyon.</p> <p><i>Grazing in the riparian area of the San Juan River SRMA would be restricted to October 1–May 31 and must meet or exceed PFC, and incorporate rest-rotation and/or deferment systems. This would include Perkins Brothers, East League, and McCracken Wash Allotments.</i></p> <p><i>Sage Flat, Upper East Canyon, Sage Grouse, and Dry Farm allotments would not be grazed from March 20 to May 15 (Gunnison Sage-grouse nesting season)².</i></p>		<p>incorporate rest-rotation and/or deferment systems. This would include Perkins Brothers, East League, and McCracken Wash Allotments.</p> <p>Sage Flat, Upper East Canyon, Sage-grouse and Dry Farm allotments would not be grazed March 20–May 15 (Gunnison Sage-grouse nesting season).</p>	<p>Montezuma Canyon allotment)</p> <p>Moki Canyon, Lake Canyon, Harts Canyon, and Indian Creek from Kelly Ranch vicinity to the USFS boundary would be restricted to livestock trailing only, no grazing, as stipulated as a Term and Condition on the pertinent grazing permit. The BLM would develop seasonal restrictions, closures, and/or forage utilization limits on grazing in riparian areas Functioning at Risk and/or Non-functional.</p> <p>Grazing in the riparian area of the San Juan River SRMA would be restricted to October 1–May 31 and must meet or exceed PFC, and incorporate rest-rotation and/or deferment systems. This would include Perkins Brothers, East League, and McCracken Wash Allotments.</p> <p>Sage Flat, Upper East Canyon, Sage Grouse and Dry Farm allotments would not be grazed from March 20 to May 15 (Gunnison Sage-grouse nesting season).</p>	<p>without a plan amendment and would be analyzed with site-specific NEPA).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Parts of the slopes of Peter's Canyon and East Canyon (15,720 acres of wildlife habitat)• Slickhorn Canyon (within Perkins Brother's Allotment).• Rone Bailey Mesa (within Upper Mail Station Allotment)• Dodge Canyon Allotment• Rogers Allotment• Portions of West Butler Wash Canyons• Horsehead Canyon (within Montezuma Canyon allotment)• Dark Canyon Area with the exception of 962 acres in Fable Valley that is limited to trailing on an annual basis and grazing use under emergency conditions <p>Lake Canyon, Harts Canyon, Shay Canyon ACEC, and Indian Creek from Kelly Ranch vicinity to USFS boundary would be restricted to livestock trailing only, no grazing, as stipulated as a Term and Condition on the pertinent grazing permit.</p> <p>Moki Canyon and Lake Canyon would be restricted to trailing only except in the spring and fall for up to 1 to 2 weeks to gather livestock prior to moving to and from these areas.</p> <p>Moki Canyon is open to grazing above the fence (northeast) at Harrison Spring and below the fence (southwest) downstream where the sand slide and road access to Moki Canyon.</p> <p>The BLM would develop seasonal restrictions, closures, and/or forage utilization limits on grazing in riparian areas deemed Functioning at Risk and/or Non-functional.</p> <p><i>*Grazing in the riparian area of the San Juan River SRMA would be restricted to October 1–May 31 and must meet or exceed PFC, and incorporate rest-rotation and/or deferment systems. This would include Perkins Brothers, East League, and McCracken Wash Allotments.</i></p> <p><i>*Sage Flat, Upper East Canyon, Sage-grouse and Dry Farm allotments would not be grazed from March 20 to May 15 (Gunnison Sage-grouse nesting season).</i></p>
MINERAL RESOURCES					
<p>GOALS AND OBJECTIVES</p> <p>Continue to meet local and national energy and other public mineral needs to the extent possible. Provide opportunities for environmentally responsible exploration and development of mineral and energy resources subject to appropriate BLM policies, laws, and regulations.</p> <p>Ensure a viable long-term industry related to leasable, locatable, and salable mineral development while providing reasonable and necessary protections to other resources. Establish conditions of use through land-use planning to protect other resource values.</p> <p>The following principles would be applied:</p> <p>Encourage and facilitate the development by private industry of public land mineral resources in a manner that satisfies national and local needs and provides for economical and environmentally sound exploration, extraction and reclamation practices;</p> <p>Process applications, permits, operating plans, mineral exchanges, leases, and other use authorizations for public lands in accordance with policy and guidance; and</p> <p>Monitor salable and leasable mineral operations to ensure proper resource recovery and evaluation, production verification, diligence and inspection, and enforcement of the lease, sale, or permit terms.</p>					
<p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ALTERNATIVES</p> <p>The plan would provide for a variety of mineral exploration and development activities. These activities would be allowed in the PA unless precluded by other program prescriptions. The stipulations identified in Appendix A would apply to these activities where they are applicable. Seasonal wildlife conditions would not apply to maintenance and operation activities for mineral production (see also Wildlife).</p> <p>WSAs and designated Wilderness would remain closed, by law, to mineral leasing and development.</p> <p>Management for geophysical work would be available unless stated specifically in alternatives that it is unavailable.</p> <p>The Monticello PA would be open for mineral entry unless specifically withdrawn by Secretarial Order, public law or segregated from mineral entry under specific reservations, such as an R&PP lease.</p>					

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

<p>In areas where the No Surface Occupancy (NSO) stipulation for oil and gas leasing is applied, the same restriction would also, where appropriate and practical, to other surface-disturbing activities (and occupancy) associated with land-use authorization, permits, and leases issued on BLM lands. The restrictions would not apply to activities and uses where they are contrary to laws, regulations or specific program guidance. The intent is to maintain consistency to extent possible in applying stipulations/restrictions to all surface-disturbing activities.</p> <p><u>Leasable Minerals</u></p> <p>Oil and Gas</p> <p>The plan would recognize and be consistent with the I National Energy Policy Act and related BLM policy by adopting the following objectives:</p> <p>recognizing the need for diversity in obtaining energy supplies;</p> <p>encouraging conservation of sensitive resource values; and</p> <p>improving energy distribution opportunities.</p> <p>All lands are available for leasing subject to standard lease terms, unless otherwise specified in the plan. Lease stipulations would be developed in the plan, where necessary, to mitigate the impacts of oil and gas activity (see Appendix A). The stipulations would adhere to the Uniform Format prepared by the Rocky Mountain Regional Coordinating Committee in March 1989. Stipulations reflect the minimum requirements necessary to accomplish the desired resource protection and, would contain provisions and criteria to allow for exception, waiver and modification if warranted. Stipulations from Section 6 of the Standard Lease Terms are incorporated for all leases. Best Management Practices (BMP) will be applied on individual Applications for Permit to Drill and associated ROWs. These procedures are based on WO IM 2007-021 and the <i>Surface Operating Standards and Guidelines for Oil and Gas Development (Gold Book)</i>, 2006.</p> <p>Oil and gas leases issued prior to the plan would continue to be managed under the stipulations in effect when issued. Those issued subsequent to this plan would be subject to the stipulations developed in this plan.</p> <p>Certain federal oil and gas resources within the Monticello PA underlie lands not administered by the BLM. The BLM administers the federal leases on these lands. These lands include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 101,720 acres within the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area (NRA) (see Glen Canyon NRA Minerals Management Plan)• 366,850 acres within the Manti–La Sal National Forest (NF), Monticello Ranger District• 51,610 acres within the Navajo Indian Reservation• 1,080 acres within Indian Trust lands• 55,390 acres on split-estate lands <p>Split-estate lands (private surface/federal minerals) and lands administered by other federal agencies are not managed by the BLM. The surface owner or surface management agency (SMA) manages the surface. The BLM administers the operational aspects of oil and gas leases. On lands administered by other federal agencies, lease stipulations would include those required by the SMA. On split-estate lands, lease stipulations would consist of those necessary to comply with non-discretionary federal laws, such as the Endangered Species Act. The one exception to this would be the stipulations developed for Gunnison Sage-grouse as identified in Appendix A. Mitigation measures would also be applied to protect other resource values such as VRM class, Recreation, and non-federally protected fish and wildlife species consistent with Section 6 of the standard lease terms. These mitigation measures would be developed during site-specific environmental analysis and would be attached as conditions of approval (COA) in consultation with the surface owner or SMA.</p> <p>In accordance with an UDEQ-DAQ letter dated June 6, 2008, (see Appendix T) requesting implementation of interim nitrogen oxide control measures for compressor engines; the BLM will require the following as a Lease Stipulation and a Condition of Approval for Applications for Permit to Drill:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• All new and replacement internal combustion gas field engines of less than or equal to 300 design-rated horsepower must not emit more than 2 gms of NO_x per horsepower-hour. This requirement does not apply to gas field engines of less than or equal to 40 design-rated horsepower.• All new and replacement internal combustion gas field engines of greater than 300 design rated horsepower must not emit more than 1.0 gms of NO_x per horsepower-hour. <p>Coal</p> <p>The coal resources within the Monticello PA are limited to the San Juan Coal Field, totaling about 530,000 acres. Approximately 60% of this field is under private ownership (both surface and mineral estate), and about 212,000 acres of federal surface and federal minerals in the coal field are administered by the Monticello FO. The potential for development of coal resources is low (see Mineral Potential Report and RFD [BLM 2005]). The public has expressed no interest in coal leasing. The RMP does not establish conditions for coal leasing or exploration requirements. This would be done through a plan amendment, should sufficient interest warrant. At such time as interest is expressed in coal leasing, the RMP would be amended and mining unsuitability criteria (43 CFR 3461) would be applied by the Monticello FO before any coal leases are issued. If coal leases are issued, they would be subject to special conditions developed in the RMP amendment and the unsuitability assessment. This may restrict all or certain types of mining techniques. Before any coal could be removed, Monticello FO would have to approve the mining permit application package, incorporating stipulations developed in the RMP.</p> <p>Tar Sand</p> <p>An Oil Shale and Tar Sands Leasing Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) is being prepared for oil shale and tar sands resources leasing on lands administered by the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) in Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming. Based upon the information and analyses developed in this PEIS, the BLM would amend LUPs for these areas.</p> <p>Potash (Nonenergy Leasable)</p> <p>Within the Monticello PA, two areas fall within Known Potash Leasing Areas (KPLAs). KPLA designations, based on known geologic data, would remain in place until potash resources are depleted. In KPLAs, potash leases are acquired through competitive bidding. In areas where potash values are not known, the Monticello PA could issue prospecting permits, which could lead to issuance of a preference right lease. The RMP establishes stipulations that would apply to prospecting permits and leases. The KPLAs are available for leasing subject to the same lease stipulations developed in the RMP for oil and gas. Additional KPLAs could be designated, based on geologic data, if interest warranted. This would be an administrative action. Exploration and mining operations for potash are conducted in accordance with the regulations at 43 CFR 3590.</p> <p>Geothermal</p> <p>A portion of the Warm Springs Canyon geothermal area (approximately 16,320 acres) extends into the Monticello PA. Low temperature geothermal waters have been recorded from springs. Because the Monticello PA is situated within the Colorado Plateau geologic province, where heat flow through the earth's crust is generally low, no high-temperature geothermal resources are expected at reasonable drilling depths. Therefore, development potential is low (see Mineral Potential Report and RFD [BLM 2005]). The public has expressed no interest in geothermal leasing. The RMP does not establish conditions for geothermal leasing or exploration requirements. This would be done through a plan amendment should sufficient interest warrant.</p> <p><u>Locatable Minerals</u></p> <p>All public domain lands overlying federal minerals are available for mining claim location unless specifically withdrawn from mineral entry by Secretarial Order or public law or segregated from mineral entry under specific reservations, such as an R&PP lease.</p> <p>The RMP may be used to recommend lands to be withdrawn from mineral entry. Claims located on these areas prior to withdrawal would not be impacted. Operations on BLM-administered lands available for mineral entry must be conducted in compliance with the BLM's surface management regulations (43 CFR Subparts 3802, 3809, 3715 and 3814). BLM surface management regulations do not apply to operations on other federal lands but do apply to all operations authorized by the mining laws on public lands where the</p>

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

<p>mineral interest is reserved to the United States, including Stock Raising Homestead lands.</p> <p>The BLM would evaluate all operations authorized by the mining laws in the context of its requirement to prevent unnecessary and undue degradation of Federal lands and resources. Consistent with the rights afforded claimants under the mining laws, operations would conform to the management prescriptions in the plan.</p> <p>Federally owned locatable minerals underlying federal lands administered by the NPS are not generally available for mineral entry. However, locatable minerals under Glen Canyon NRA may be leased under Title 43 of the Code of Federal Regulations, part 3500 (43 CFR 3500) in accordance with the Mineral Management Plan for the NRA.</p> <p>Salable Minerals</p> <p>All BLM-administered lands in the Monticello PA would be placed in one of the following three categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Available for disposal of mineral material subject to standard conditions.• Available for disposal of mineral material subject to special conditions.• Unavailable for disposal of mineral material. <p>The plan would develop management conditions for disposal of mineral materials under each category. These management conditions would correspond respectively to the oil and gas leasing stipulations developed in the RMP, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Standard lease terms• TL and CSU• NSO and closed <p>There are currently 16 community pits, totaling about 5,505 acres, designated in the current 1991 San Juan RMP.</p>					
Lands Available for Oil and Gas Leasing ¹					
Alternative A (No Action) (Map 27)	Alternative B (Map 28)	Alternative C (Preferred) (Map 29)	Alternative D (Map 30)	Alternative E (Map 31)	Proposed Plan (Map 32)
Acres available for leasing subject to standard lease terms (Category 1): 578,604 The RMP reported 584,270 acres but was modified as discussed below***	Approximately 365,170 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing, subject to standard lease terms.	Approximately 629,472 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing, subject to standard lease terms.	Approximately 962,283 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing, subject to standard lease terms.	Approximately 213,290 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing, subject to standard lease terms.	Approximately 484,217 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing, subject to standard lease terms.
Acres available for leasing subject to special conditions (Category 2): 659,626 The RMP reported 815,690 acres but was modified as discussed below***	TL: Approximately 786,489 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing subject to timing limitations. CSU: Approximately 67,288 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing subject to controlled surface use. CST: Approximately 22,963 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing subject to timing limitations and controlled surface use.	TL: Approximately 569,657 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing subject to timing limitations. CSU: Approximately 51,419 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing subject to controlled surface use. CST: Approximately 98,425 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing subject to timing limitations and controlled surface use.	TL: Approximately 418,242 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing subject to timing limitations. CSU: Approximately 2,758 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing subject to controlled surface use. CST: Approximately 0 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing subject to timing limitations and controlled surface use.	TL: Approximately 511,649 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing subject to timing limitations. CSU: Approximately 25,428 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing subject to controlled surface use. CST: Approximately 8,564 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing subject to timing limitations and controlled surface use.	TL: Approximately 594,469 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing subject to timing limitations. CSU: Approximately 60,741 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing subject to controlled surface use. CST: Approximately 85,384 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing subject to timing limitations and controlled surface use.
Acres available subject to NSO: 161,224 The RMP reported 268,080 acres but was modified as discussed below***	NSO: Approximately 125,105 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing subject to no surface occupancy.	NSO: Approximately 39,323 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing subject to no surface occupancy.	NSO: Approximately 14,175 acres would be administratively available subject to no surface occupancy.	NSO: Approximately 53,915 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing subject to no surface occupancy.	NSO: Approximately 66,108 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing subject to no surface occupancy. Dark Canyon (11,619 acres) non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics are available subject to no surface occupancy.
Acres unavailable for leasing: 385,316—current management The RMP reported 111,170 acres but was modified as discussed below.**	Approximately 416,612 acres would be unavailable for leasing.	Approximately 395,329 acres would be unavailable for leasing.	Approximately 386,853 acres would be unavailable for leasing.	Approximately 974,463 acres would be unavailable for leasing.	Approximately 493,400 acres would be unavailable for leasing. Mancos Mesa, Nokai Dome West, Nokai Dome East and Grand Gulch non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics are unavailable for oil and gas leasing.
*** Actual acreage for current management differs from the RMP acreage because WSAs were unavailable for leasing by the IMP. The 1991 San Juan RMP did not close the WSAs to leasing and the acres were not taken into account at the time of RMP. Most of these areas were ACECs and available for leasing subject to special conditions.					
¹ NSO—No Surface Occupancy; TL—Timing Limitations; CSU—Controlled Surface Use; CST—Controlled Surface Use and Timing Limitations					

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

Lands Available for Mineral Entry					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Approximately 1,652,743 acres would be available for mineral entry.	Approximately 1,533,413 acres would be available for mineral entry.	Approximately 1,663,211 acres would be available for mineral entry.	Approximately 1,738,992 acres would be available for mineral entry.	Approximately 951,053 acres would be available for mineral entry.	Approximately 1,734,458 acres would be available for mineral entry.
Approximately 132,380 acres would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry (Map 5).	Approximately 251,710 acres would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry (Map 6).	Approximately 121,912 acres would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry (Map 7).	Approximately 46,131 acres would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry (Map 8).	Approximately 834,070 acres would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry (Map 9).	Approximately 50,665 acres would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry (Map 10).
Lands Available for Mineral Material Disposal					
Alternative A (No Action) (Map 21)	Alternative B (Map 22)	Alternative C (Preferred) (Map 23)	Alternative D (Map 24)	Alternative E (Map 25)	Proposed Plan (Map 26)
Approximately 584,270 acres would be available for disposal of mineral materials subject to standard terms and conditions.	Approximately 365,168 acres would be available for disposal of mineral materials subject to standard terms and conditions.	Approximately 624,734 acres would be available for disposal of mineral materials subject to standard terms and conditions.	Approximately 962,279 acres would be available for disposal of mineral materials subject to standard terms and conditions.	Approximately 213,290 acres would be available for disposal of mineral materials subject to standard terms and conditions.	Approximately 624,734 acres would be available for disposal of mineral materials subject to standard terms and conditions.
Approximately 821,070 acres would be available for disposal of mineral materials subject to special conditions.	Approximately 876,736 acres would be available for disposal of mineral materials subject to special conditions.	Approximately 724,234 acres would be available for disposal of mineral materials subject to special conditions.	Approximately 420,998 acres would be available for disposal of mineral materials subject to special conditions.	Approximately 545,641 acres would be available for disposal of mineral materials subject to special conditions.	Approximately 724,234 acres would be available for disposal of mineral materials subject to special conditions.
Approximately 373,850 acres would be unavailable for disposal of mineral materials.	Approximately 542,402 acres would be unavailable for disposal of mineral materials.	Approximately 435,338 acres would be unavailable for disposal of mineral materials.	Approximately 401,026 acres would be unavailable for disposal of mineral materials.	Approximately 1,025,378 acres would be unavailable for disposal of mineral materials.	Approximately 435,338 acres would be unavailable for disposal of mineral materials.
NON-WSA LANDS WITH WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS					
The BLM has identified non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics for management consideration in this planning effort. Wilderness characteristics include the appearance of naturalness and outstanding opportunities for solitude or primitive and unconfined recreation.					
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES: Protect, maintain and preserve wilderness characteristics (appearance of naturalness and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation or solitude) of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics as appropriate, considering manageability and the context of competing resource demands. Manage these primitive lands and backcountry landscapes for their undeveloped character, and to provide opportunities for primitive recreational activities and experiences of solitude, as appropriate.					
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ALTERNATIVES: There would be no management common to all for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics were not addressed in the 1991 San Juan Resource Area RMP, as amended. These lands are managed according to the 1991 San Juan RMP prescriptions.	No management prescriptions identified for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	No management prescriptions identified for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	No management prescriptions identified for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	Manage 582,360 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics for their wilderness characteristics (Map 33) in 29 areas. The following management would apply: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Unavailable for mineral leasingClosed for OHV useROW exclusion areasClosed to disposal of mineral materialsUnavailable for private and commercial woodland harvestUnavailable for land treatmentsVRM Class IRecommended for withdrawal from mineral entry	Manage 88,871 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics for their wilderness characteristics (Map 34) in 5 individual areas: Dark Canyon (11,540 acres), Mancos Mesa (30,068 acres), Nokai Dome West (14,988 acres), Nokai Dome East (18,618 acres) and Grand Gulch (13,657 acres). The following management would apply: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Unavailable for mineral leasing in Mancos Mesa, Nokai Dome West, Nokai Dome East and Grand Gulch; no surface occupancy for mineral leasing (NSO) in Dark CanyonOHV travel limited to designated roads and trailsROW avoidance areasClosed to disposal of mineral materialsUnavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest except for on-site collection of dead wood for campfiresAvailable for range, watershed or habitat improvements and vegetation treatments if beneficial or nonimpairing to wilderness characteristics and would meet VRM Class II

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

				<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Unavailable for geothermal leasing• Unavailable for coal leasing• Fire suppression would be through light on the land techniques	<p>objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• VRM Class II for surface-disturbing activities• All existing improvements could be maintained at their current level• Unavailable for coal leasing• Unavailable for geothermal leasing• Fire suppression would be through light on the land techniques
PALEONTOLOGY					
<p>GOALS AND OBJECTIVES</p> <p>Identify area-wide criteria or site-specific use restrictions where necessary to protect paleontological resources from surface-disturbing activities and to promote the scientific, educational, and recreational uses of fossils. Foster public awareness and appreciation of the paleontological heritage.</p>					
<p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ALTERNATIVES</p> <p>Recreational collectors may collect and retain reasonable amounts of common invertebrate and plant fossils for personal, noncommercial use. Surface disturbance must be negligible, and mechanized tools may not be used. Petrified wood collection would be limited to amounts mandated in BLM regulations. Collection of scientifically noteworthy and/or uncommon invertebrate and plant fossils may require a permit. Vertebrate fossils may be collected only under a permit issued by the authorized officer to qualified individuals. Vertebrate fossils include bones, teeth, eggs, and other body parts of animals with backbones such as dinosaurs, fish, turtles, and mammals. Vertebrate fossils also include trace fossils such as footprints, burrows, and dung. Casting of vertebrate fossils, including dinosaur tracks, would be prohibited unless allowed under a scientific/research permit issued by the Utah State BLM Office. Fossils collected under a permit remain the property of the federal government and must be placed in a suitable repository (such as a museum or university) identified at the time of permit issuance. Lands identified for disposal or exchange would be evaluated to determine whether such actions would remove important fossils from federal ownership. In areas where surface disturbance, either initiated by the BLM or by other land users, may threaten substantial or noteworthy fossils, the BLM would follow its policy per Paleontology Resources Management Manual and Handbook 8370-1 (BLM 1998a) to assess any threat and mitigate damage. Where scientifically noteworthy fossils are threatened by natural hazards or unauthorized collection, the BLM would work with permittees and other partners to salvage specimens and reduce future threats to resources at risk.</p>					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Not specified.	Conduct on-site evaluation of surface-disturbing activities for all Category 3, 4/5, and 5 areas, and avoid impacts to paleontological resources.	Conduct on-site evaluation of surface-disturbing activities for all Category 5 areas and minimize impacts to paleontological resources to the degree practicable. Evaluation will consider the type of surface disturbance proposed and mitigation will be developed based on site-specific information.	Not specified.	Same as Alternative B.	Conduct on-site evaluation of surface-disturbing activities for all Category 5 areas and minimize impacts to paleontological resources to the degree practicable. Evaluation will consider the type of surface disturbance proposed and mitigation will be developed based on site-specific information.
RECREATION					
<p>GOAL</p> <p>To provide for multiple recreational uses of the public lands and to sustain a wide range of recreation opportunities and potential experiences for visitors and residents while supporting local economic stability and sustaining the recreation resource base and other sensitive resource values.</p> <p><u>Explanation of Recreation Planning Concepts</u></p> <p>Under all alternatives, the primary framework for recreation management in the Monticello PA is the Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA). This is used to define the following components of the recreation program: OHV designations, recreation permitting, developed recreation facilities, campsite designation, tourism, and heritage tourism. SRMAs are discussed below to provide the reader with an understanding of how this concept would be used to manage recreation in the Monticello PA. The management tools and techniques that would be used to support these concepts are discussed within each alternative.</p> <p>Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs)</p> <p>SRMAs are defined under LUP Handbook Appendix C, Recreation and Visitor Services, as "... having a distinct, primary recreation-tourism market as well as a corresponding and distinguishing recreation management strategy..." For each SRMA identified, delineate discrete recreation management zone (RMZ) boundaries. Each RMZ has four defining characteristics; it: 1) serves a different recreation niche within the primary recreation market; 2) produces a different set of recreation opportunities and facilitates the attainment of different experience and benefit outcomes (to individuals, households and communities, economies, and the environment; 3) has distinctive recreation setting character; and 4) requires a different set of recreation provider actions to meet the strategically targeted primary recreation market demand."</p> <p>SRMAs are designated in each of the alternatives to meet the goals and objectives of the recreation program and to adhere to agency guidance as described above.</p> <p>Extensive Recreation Management Areas (ERMAs)</p>					

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

The LUP Handbook Appendix C, Recreation and Visitor Services, defines an extensive recreation management area (ERMA) as an areas not delineated as an SRMA. Management within all ERMA's is restricted to custodial actions only.
<p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ALTERNATIVES</p> <p>Continue existing reservations issued to the BLM for all existing developed recreation sites and facilities. Issue similar protective reservations for all new recreation facilities.</p> <p>Manage recreation to meet Utah's Rangeland Health Standards guided by the Standards for Public Land Health and Guidelines for Recreation Management. (Appendix E). The guidelines describe the procedures that should be applied to achieve standards for rangeland health within the recreation program.</p> <p><u>BLM Recreation Guidelines</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Recognize that various levels of regulations and limits are necessary. Restrictions and limitations on public uses should be as minimal as possible without compromising the primary goal.• Use on-the-ground presence (BLM, site stewards, volunteers) as a tool to protect public lands.• Limit or control activities where long-term damage by recreational uses is observed or anticipated through specialized management tools such as designated campsites, permits, area closures, and limitations on number of users and duration of use. Revise recreation area management plans (RAMP) as necessary to maintain public land health.• Coordinate with federal and state agencies, county and local governments, and tribal nations in recreation planning and managing traffic, search and rescue operations, trash control and removal, and public safety.• Consider and, where appropriate, implement management methods to protect the resource, as well as maintain the quality of experience of the various user groups. These methods could include limitation of numbers, types, timing, and duration of use.• Encourage the location of public land recreational activities near population centers and highway corridors by placement of appropriate visitor-use infrastructure. Provide restrooms and other facilities that would be adequate for anticipated uses at designated campgrounds, trailheads, and other areas where there is a concentration of recreational users.• Emphasize "Leave No Trace" camping and travel techniques throughout the Monticello PA.• Consider and, where appropriate, implement management methods to protect natural and cultural resources and while giving consideration to community and economic impacts, implement management methods to maintain or enhance recreation opportunities. Management methods may include limitation of visitor numbers, camping and travel controls, implementation of fees, alteration of when use takes place, and other similar actions as they are approved through normal BLM procedures.• Coordinate management of recreation use with other agencies, state and local government, and tribal units to provide public benefits, help assure public safety, and make effective use of staff and budget resources.• Recreational OHV and mechanized travel would be consistent with route and area designations described in the travel management decisions. The BLM would work with agency and government officials and permit holders to develop procedures, protocols, permits or other types of authorization, as appropriate, to provide reasonable access for non-recreational use of OHVs for military, search and rescue, emergency, administrative, and permitted uses.• OHV access for game retrieval would follow all area and route designations. (There would be no off-road retrieval.)• Dispersed camping, where allowed when not specifically restricted, may be closed seasonally or as impacts or environmental conditions warrant. <p><u>General Recreation Management Decisions</u></p> <p>Allow development of hiking paths and trails within the PA subject to site-specific NEPA.</p> <p>The following actions require a signed agreement with the specified agency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Manage the BLM portion of the Colorado River in coordination with Canyonlands National Park and the Moab BLM FO.• Manage the BLM portion of the San Juan River in coordination with Glen Canyon National Recreation Area and the Navajo Nation.• Manage the BLM portion of Dark Canyon Complex in coordination with Manti-La Sal National Forest and Glen Canyon National Recreation Area.• Manage the BLM portion of the Keeley Trail in coordination with Hovenweep National Monument. <p><u>Management of Existing and Development of Future Recreation Facilities</u></p> <p>Existing developed recreation sites would be maintained. New sites/facilities/trails would be developed in response to user demand, amenity value, and critical resource protection needs.</p> <p>All developed recreation sites would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.</p> <p>Recreation facilities would be closed to disposal of mineral materials.</p> <p>Developed recreation sites would be available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO. NSO boundaries around developed recreation sites are defined as one quarter mile from the perimeter of campgrounds and 200 meters from the perimeter of other developed recreation sites.</p> <p>These sites would also be available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO and unavailable for disposal of mineral materials.</p> <p>Grazing would be excluded from developed recreation sites.</p> <p>Developed recreation facilities are unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.</p> <p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ACTION ALTERNATIVES</p> <p><u>General Recreation Management Decisions</u></p> <p>Benefits Based Management Goals and Objectives (BBMs) have been written for most SRMA. (See Appendix E, Recreation.)</p> <p>No camping within 200 feet of isolated springs to allow space for wildlife to access water.</p> <p>No camping is allowed within cultural sites or archaeological resources as defined ARPA.</p> <p><u>Management of Existing and Development of Future Recreation Facilities</u></p> <p>Develop or improve development of recreation sites as prioritized below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Kane Gulch Ranger Station (40 acres)• Sand Island Campground (21 acres)

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mexican Hat Launch site (20 acres)• Hamburger Rock Campground (20 acres)• Comb Wash Campground (10 acres)• Butler Wash Ruin (60 acres)• Mule Canyon Ruin (10 acres)• Three Kiva Pueblo (10 acres)• Shay Mountain Vista Campground (20 acres)• Indian Creek Recreational and Camping Facilities as outlined in the Indian Creek Recreation Corridor Plan (BLM 2005).• The BLM would work with Natural Bridges National Monument to develop an overflow camping area. No campfires would be allowed in these overflow camping areas.• The BLM would work with Canyonlands National Park Needles District to develop an overflow camping area.
SPECIAL RECREATION MANAGEMENT AREAS (SRMA)
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES Provide general recreation management guidance and subsequent implementation of management decisions for activity plan–level actions for SRMAs through continuation of approved Recreation Area Management Plans (RAMPs) and development of new RAMPs for all SRMAs. If necessary, activity plans would be written for SRMAs. Review and update RAMPS as necessary to make adjustments for changing conditions and opportunities. Domestic pets and pack animals would not be allowed in cultural sites or on archaeological resources as defined in ARPA. Ropes and other climbing aids would not be allowed for access to cultural sites or archaeological resources as defined in ARPA, except for emergencies or administrative needs. Camping would not be allowed within cultural sites or archaeological resources as defined in ARPA. Cultural sites may be closed to visitation when they are determined to be at risk or pose visitor safety hazards. General SRMA Guidelines Identify additional SRMAs or add areas to SRMAs as necessary to respond to changing management circumstances. Establishment of post-RMP SRMAs or revision of SRMA boundaries would require a plan amendment. The criteria for establishment of post-RMP SRMAs or revising SRMA boundaries include: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Recreation use requires intensive management to provide recreation opportunities or maintain resource values.• A recreation area management plan or interdisciplinary plan with intensive recreation management decisions is approved.• The BLM announces designation and plan approval through media. All recreation management activities and developments in the SRMA would be in support of the individual SRMA goals and objectives.
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ACTION ALTERNATIVES General SRMA Guidelines All SRMAs would be designated as special areas under the Land and Water Conservation Fund definition. As per the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act and the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act, this could require permits and payment of fees for recreation use.
San Juan River SRMA
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES Provide outstanding river related recreational opportunities and visitor experiences while protecting natural and cultural resource values with integrated management between the BLM, NPS, and the Navajo Nation. Allow for boating and rafting activities regulated through permit issuance. By the year 2012, manage this SRMA to provide opportunities for visitors to realize personal development and growth, enhanced lifestyle increased local tourism revenue and maintenance of distinct recreation setting character, providing no fewer than 80% of responding visitors and impacted community residents at least a moderate realization of these benefits: (i.e., 3.0 on a probability scale where 1 = not at all, 2 = somewhat, 3 = moderate, 4 = total realization).
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ALTERNATIVES Permits would be issued to commercial companies on a five-year designated basis. They would also be issued to private users through an annual lottery system. River trips on the San Juan River would require a special use permit. Unavailable for woodland product use, except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. Woodland use within the floodplain would be limited to collection of driftwood for campfires. Cottonwood and willow harvest would be allowed for Native American ceremonial uses only by permit. Restrictions on this permitted harvest would be implemented as necessary to achieve or maintain Proper Functioning Condition (PFC), and to maintain or improve threatened and endangered species/special status species (TES/SSS) habitat. Backpackers in Slickhorn Canyon and Grand Gulch would not be allowed to camp within 1 mile of the river. Campfire use only with a fire pan.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

The bench above Sand Island Campground (256 acres) would be closed to camping.					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
SRMA, 15,100 acres (non-GIS calculation from the 1991 RMP) managed to preserve ROS P-class and protect ROS SPNM-class (9,380 acres) (Map 36).	The San Juan River would be managed as an SRMA (10,203 acres) (Map 37). The boundary would remain as in previous RMP. Efforts would be made to purchase private lands within the SRMA boundary. The SRMA boundary east of existing oil and gas leasing category III (NSO) would be below the bench, thereby allowing access to high-quality gravel.	The San Juan River would be managed as an SRMA (9,859 acres) (Map 38). The boundary would remain as in the previous RMP with the exception of State Section 16 and the Holliday Pit Quarry on Lime Ridge. The SRMA boundary east of existing oil and gas leasing category III (NSO) would be below the bench, thereby allowing access to high-quality gravel.	The San Juan River would be managed as an SRMA (6,365 acres) (Map 39). The SRMA boundary east of existing oil and gas leasing category III (NSO) would be below the bench, thereby allowing access to high-quality gravel.	Same as Alternative B (Map 37), except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, unavailable for OHV use, ROW exclusion areas, unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, VRM Class I, and recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry.	The San Juan River would be managed as an SRMA (9,859 acres) (Map 40). The boundary would remain as in the previous RMP with the exception of State Section 16 or the Holliday Pit Quarry on Lime Ridge. The SRMA boundary east of existing oil and gas leasing category III (NSO) would be below the bench, thereby allowing access to high-quality gravel.
Motorized Boating					
Downstream travel is allowed at low, wakeless speed. Upstream travel is prohibited, except for emergency purposes (SPM).	No motorized boating would be allowed, except for emergency purposes.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.	Downstream travel is allowed at low, wakeless speed. Upstream travel is prohibited, except for emergency purposes (SPM).
Launch Limits					
Current launch limits allow approximately 40,000 user/days per year, private and commercial trips combined. Trip size is limited to 25 people on private trips, and 25 passengers plus 8 crew on commercial trips.	Launch limits would be reduced to provide a river experience that improves visitor experience and perception of solitude, and would reduce potential impacts on the resource. Launch schedules would allow approximately 30,000 user/days per year. Trip size would be limited to 20 people (including crew) for both private and commercial use.	Launch limits would be changed to allow for an improved visitor experience (e.g., hiking opportunities) and increased perception of solitude below Mexican Hat while remaining within the limitations set by the availability of campsites between Slickhorn Canyon and Clay Hills. Launch limits would allow approximately 40,000 user/days per year. Trip size would be limited to 25 people (including crew) total for both private and commercial trips.	Launch limits would be raised to allow for increased visitor access to resources. Launch schedules would allow approximately 45,000 user/days per year, private and commercial trips combined. Trip size would be increased to a maximum of 35 people per trip for both private and commercial use.	Same as Alternative B. Available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO.	Launch limits would be changed to allow for an improved visitor experience (e.g., hiking opportunities) and increased perception of solitude below Mexican Hat while remaining within the limitations set by the availability of campsites between Slickhorn Canyon and Clay Hills. Launch limits would allow approximately 40,000 user/days per year. Trip size would be limited to 25 people (including crew) total for both private and commercial trips.
Commercial/Private Allocations					
Commercial use, including day trips, is allowed up to 50% of total use. Commercial day trips are not included in launch limits.	Commercial use would be restricted to 30% of total use. One commercial day trip would be allowed and would be included in the allocation and launch limits.	Commercial use would be allowed up to 40% of total use. One commercial day trip per day would be allowed and would not be included in the launch limits.	Commercial/private allocation would be split on a 50/50 basis. Commercial day trips would be allowed on an unlimited basis and would not be included in the launch limits.	Same as Alternative B.	Commercial use would be allowed up to 40% of total use. One commercial day trip per day would be allowed and would not be included in the launch limits.
Administrative/Research Use					
Administrative and research use is currently not included in the launch limits.	Administrative and research use would be restricted to use that can be accommodated within the launch limit.	Administrative and research use would be authorized on a case-by-case review and determination.	Same as Alternative C.	Same as Alternative B.	Administrative and research use would be authorized on a case-by-case review and determination.
Visitor Services					
Minimal visitor services at Sand Island and Mexican Hat ramp areas	Minimal visitor services at Sand Island and Mexican Hat ramp areas	Same as Alternative B.	Increased visitor services, including trash receptacles and toilet clean-out	Same as Alternative B.	Minimal visitor services at Sand Island and Mexican Hat ramp areas would be provided for visitor health and safety and

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

are provided for visitor health and safety and resource protection.	would be provided for visitor health and safety and resource protection.		facilities, would be provided for visitor health and safety and resource protection at Sand Island, Mexican Hat ramp areas.		resource protection.
Designated Campsites					
To minimize conflict in the area from Slickhorn Canyon to Clay Hills, 9 campsites are available for reservation at the time the permit is issued. From May 15 to June 15, only 1 night is allowed in the reserved area. At other time, 2 nights are allowed if available, but must be at 2 different campsites (i.e., 2 nights cannot be spent at the same campsite).	An MOU would be signed between the NPS/GCNRA and the Navajo Nation. This memorandum would include details on numbers of campsites and their associated permit restrictions.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	An MOU would be signed between the NPS/GCNRA and the Navajo Nation. This memorandum would include details on numbers of campsites and their associated permit restrictions.
Non-boating Use					
Vehicle camping is not restricted.	With the exceptions of along Lime Creek Road, the Mexican Hat Rock area, and Mexican Hat Boat Ramp, vehicle camping would be allowed within the San Juan SRMA only upstream of Comb Wash. Lime Creek campsite would be reserved for river runners only. All campers (including backpackers) must have carry-out toilets. The bench above Sand Island Recreation Area would be closed to camping, including portions outside of the SRMA. Area wide, camping would be closed within 0.5 mile of designated campsites.	Same as Alternative B.	Vehicle camping would not be restricted within the San Juan River SRMA, except for the following: The bench above Sand Island Recreation Area would be closed to camping, including portions outside of the SRMA. Area wide, camping would be closed within a 0.5 mile of designated campsites.	With the exception of along Lime Creek Road, and the Mexican Hat Rock area, and Mexican Hat Boat Ramp, vehicle camping would be allowed within the San Juan SRMA only upstream of Comb Wash. Lime Creek campsite would be reserved for river runners only. All campers (including backpackers) must have carry-out toilets. The bench above Sand Island Recreation Area would be closed to camping, including portions outside of the SRMA. Area wide, camping would be closed within a ½ mile of designated campsites.	With the exceptions of along Lime Creek Road, the Mexican Hat Rock area and Mexican Hat Boat Ramp, vehicle camping would be allowed within the San Juan SRMA only upstream of Comb Wash. In this area, dispersed vehicle camping would be allowed in previously disturbed areas within 150 feet of designated routes. Lime Creek campsite would be reserved for river runners only. All campers (including backpackers) must have carry-out toilets. The bench above Sand Island Recreation Area would be closed to camping, including portions outside of the SRMA. Area wide, camping would be closed within 0.5 mile of designated campsites.
Minerals					
Managed as described in 1991 San Juan RMP (BLM 1991a), pages 78 and 100. Available for mineral leasing with special conditions. Available for geophysical. Available for mineral entry with an approved plan of operations.	Available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO and recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry and unavailable for disposal of mineral materials.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO and recommended unavailable for locatable mineral entry. and disposal, except for lands with wilderness characteristics that would be unavailable for oil and gas leasing.	Available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO and recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry and unavailable for disposal of mineral materials.
Grazing					
Available for livestock use.	Grazing in the riparian area would be restricted to October 1–May 31	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	<i>*Grazing in the riparian area would be restricted to October 1–May 31³ and must meet or exceed PFC, and incorporate rest-</i>

³ This is an implementation-level decision that cannot be protested under the planning regulations. Please see the cover letter for further information.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

	and must meet or exceed PFC, and incorporate rest-rotation and/or deferment systems. This would include Perkins Brothers, East League, and McCracken Wash Allotments.				rotation and/or deferment systems. This would include Perkins Brothers (outside Slickhorn Canyon), East League, and McCracken Wash Allotments.
Watershed					
	Watershed control structures would be subject to surface restrictions and seasonal restrictions to protect bighorn sheep lambing and rutting areas. Vehicle access in other areas within the SRMA would be limited to designated routes. Area would be subject to fire suppression to protect riparian habitat.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	No vehicle access through non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. Watershed structures would have to meet VRM Class I objectives.	Watershed control structures would be subject to surface restrictions and seasonal restrictions to protect bighorn sheep lambing and rutting areas. Vehicle access in other areas within the SRMA would be limited to designated routes. Area would be subject to fire suppression to protect riparian habitat.
Other					
	Would be managed to maintain an environment of isolation insofar as allowed by river permit and patrol system. Surface disturbance from mining activities on existing claims would be limited to the extent possible without unnecessary impact to valid existing rights. The area above the rim in the vicinity of the Bluff airport lease would be available for mineral materials disposal. No vehicle access would be allowed from Comb Wash downstream to Lime Creek, and below Mexican Hat Bridge. OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails.	Would be managed to maintain an environment of isolation insofar as allowed by river permit and patrol system. Surface disturbance from mining activities on existing claims would be limited to the extent possible without unnecessary impact to valid existing rights. No vehicle access would be allowed from Comb Wash downstream to Lime Creek and below Mexican Hat Bridge (except for motorized boat use on the river). Mechanized/motorized travel would be limited to designated routes.	Would be managed to maintain an environment of isolation insofar as allowed by river permit and patrol system. Surface disturbing from mining activities on existing claims would be limited to the extent possible without unnecessary impact to valid existing rights. The area above the rim in the vicinity of the Bluff airport lease would be available for minerals materials disposal. No vehicle access would be allowed from Comb Wash downstream to Lime Creek, and below Mexican Hat Bridge. OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails.	Same as Alternative B.	Would be managed to maintain an environment of isolation insofar as allowed by river permit and patrol system. Surface disturbance from mining activities on existing claims would be limited to the extent possible without unnecessary impact to valid existing rights. No vehicle access would be allowed from Comb Wash downstream to Lime Creek and below Mexican Hat Bridge (except for motorized boat use on the river). Mechanized/motorized travel would be limited to designated routes.
Grand Gulch Plateau SRMA	Cedar Mesa Cultural SRMA (C-SRMA)				Cedar Mesa SRMA
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES					
Provide outstanding recreational opportunities and visitor experiences while protecting natural and cultural resource values through integrated management between the BLM and NPS.					
Provide a safe, natural well-designed accessible recreational experience for all visitors to enjoy the world renowned cultural resources and scenic values. Use visitor information and interpretation as a primary tool to protect sensitive resources, discourage vandalism, and encourage visitor appreciation of public lands.					
By the year 2012, manage this SRMA to provide opportunities for visitors to realize personal development and growth, enhanced lifestyle increased local tourism revenue and maintenance of distinct recreation setting character, providing no fewer than 80% of responding visitors and impacted community residents at least a moderate realization of these benefits (i.e., 3.0 on a probability scale where 1 = not at all, 2 = somewhat, 3 = moderate, 4 = total realization).					
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ALTERNATIVES					
Portions of the Cedar Mesa SRMA overlay four existing WSAs (Grand Gulch ISA Complex, Fish Creek Canyon, Mule Canyon and Road Canyon, Map 56) and the Valley of the Gods ACEC. WSAs would be managed according to the IMP and Valley of the Gods ACEC would be managed as VRM Class I, unavailable for private and commercial use of woodland products, campfires are not allowed, among other restrictions (see the Valley of the Gods ACEC section in this Chapter under Special Designations).					
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ACTION ALTERNATIVES					
A joint recreation/cultural resources management plan (CRMP) would be written for this area based on the RMP.					

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
<p>The following stipulations would apply to the Grand Gulch Plateau SRMA (385,000 acres) (Map 36):</p> <p>Camping Allowed only at existing campsites. No new campsites may be developed. Camping in Grand Gulch between Kane Gulch and Bullet Canyon is limited to no more than 2 consecutive nights at one campsite. The bench surrounding Split Level Ruin in Grand Gulch is closed to camping. No unauthorized use of existing corrals.</p> <p>Campfires Prohibited in all canyons.</p> <p>Areas for Day Stock Use Only Bullet Canyon from Grand Gulch to Jailhouse Ruin. Two miles upstream Fish Canyon from the confluence with Owl Canyon, McLoyd Canyon to impassable pour-off, and Owl Canyon to Nevills Arch.</p> <p>Pets No limit or fees for pets. All pets must be collared, leashed, and under human control at all times. No pets are allowed in Slickhorn Canyon or below Collins Canyon in Grand Gulch. Pets are not allowed in or at any alcoves, rock art sites, or ruins. Pets must not harass wildlife. Pets must not harass visitors and other visitors' pets. Pets are not allowed to swim in springs, pot holes, or other natural water sources. Pet waste must be buried in a shallow hole away from trails, campsites, cultural sites, and natural water sources.</p> <p>Stock (horses, llamas, goats, etc.) All commercial and private stock use requires a permit. GGPA allows 1 stock trip at any one time allowed in GGPA, includes day use. Other Cedar Mesa canyons allow 1 overnight stock trip at any one time, and unlimited day use.</p> <p>Overnight Stock Use Areas Kane Gulch, Collins Canyon, Government Trail, Grand Gulch from Kane Gulch to Collins Canyon, Fish Creek Canyon from Comb Wash to confluence with Owl Canyon, Mule Canyon South of U-</p>	<p>Cedar Mesa Cultural Special Recreation Management Area (375,739 acres) (Map 37), formerly the Grand Gulch Plateau SRMA, would be managed according to guidelines stipulated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Where livestock grazing is permitted mitigation activities may be implemented if cultural resources are determined to be at risk.Available for watershed, range, and wildlife improvements and vegetation treatments.Mesa tops and canyons closed to campfire use.Unavailable for commercial and/or private use of woodland products including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.Open to dispersed camping, except in areas where cultural resources are at risk.Managed as VRM Class III and IV. <p>Pets and Stock Same as Alternative A with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Pets would not be allowed in canyons requiring permits. (Grand Gulch and its tributaries), Fish Canyon, Owl Canyon, McLoyd Canyon, Slickhorn Canyon, Road Canyon, Lime Canyon, and North and South Mule Canyons).Recreational stock (horses, pack animals, etc.) would not be allowed in canyons requiring permits.	<p>Cedar Mesa Cultural Special Recreation Management Area (375,739 acres) (Map 38), formerly the Grand Gulch Plateau SRMA, would be managed the same as Alternative B, except for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Campfires allowed on mesa tops only; fire pan required.Available for commercial and/or private use of woodland products including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires (outside WSAs and canyons bottoms). <p>Pets and Stock Same as Alternative A with these exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">If resources or the visitors' experiences are adversely impacted, pets and or stock animals may be limited or prohibited in canyons requiring permits.Limitations on stock use would be identical to Alternative A with the exception that stock day use would be limited to 1 party per day per trailhead in all canyons requiring permits (except Grand Gulch and McLoyd).Stock would be limited to 8 animals.	<p>Cedar Mesa Cultural Special Recreation Management Area (375,739 acres) (Map 39), formerly the Grand Gulch Plateau SRMA, would be managed the same as Alternative C, except for the following:</p> <p>Pets and Stock Same as Alternative A with the exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">If resources or the visitors' experiences are adversely impacted, pets and or stock animals may be limited or prohibited. People with pets would be required to conform to stipulations described in Alternative A.Stock limitations would be the same as Alternative A.	<p>Cedar Mesa Cultural Special Recreation Management Area (375,739 acres) (Map 37), formerly the Grand Gulch Plateau SRMA, would be managed according to guidelines stipulated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Where livestock grazing is permitted mitigation activities may be implemented if cultural resources are determined to be at risk.Available for watershed, range, and wildlife improvements and vegetation treatments on lands without wilderness characteristics (acreage). On lands with wilderness characteristics, maintenance of existing improvements is allowed, no new improvements will be allowed.Mesa tops and canyons closed to campfire use.Unavailable for commercial and/or private use of woodland products including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.Open to dispersed camping, except in areas where cultural resources are at risk.Permits will be Limited (25 people total) for day hikes and overnight camping to prevent cultural site damage.Lands without wilderness characteristics will be managed as VRM Class III and IV. Lands with wilderness characteristic will be managed as VRM Class I. <p>Pets and Stock Same as Alternative A with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Pets would not be allowed in canyons requiring permits. (Grand Gulch and its tributaries), Fish Canyon, Owl Canyon, McLoyd Canyon, Slickhorn Canyon, Road Canyon, Lime Canyon, and North and South Mule Canyon).Recreational stock (horses, pack animals, etc.) would not be allowed in canyons requiring permits.	<p>The Cedar Mesa SRMA (407,098 acres) (Map 40), formerly the Grand Gulch Plateau SRMA, would include three Recreation Management Zones focused on more intense recreational use; Grand Gulch National Historic District Recreation Management Zone (37,388), Comb Ridge Recreation Management Zone (30,752 acres) and the McLoyd-Moon House Recreation Management Zone (1,607 acres). More specific or restrictive management is outlined under these three management zones and presented below. Generally, this SRMA would be managed according to the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Where livestock grazing is permitted mitigation activities may be implemented if cultural resources are determined to be at risk.Available for watershed, range, and wildlife improvements and vegetation treatments.Campfires allowed on mesa tops only; fire pan required.Available for private and/or commercial use of woodland products including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. Access to available areas would be limited to designated roads and trails, dependent on cultural Class III surveys and occur outside WSAs and canyon bottoms. Traditional cultural use by Native Americans of woodland products is allowed as long as other resource values are not adversely affected.Open to dispersed camping except in areas where cultural resources are at risk.Managed as VRM Class II, III and IV outside of WSAs and Valley of the Gods ACEC. <p>Pets and Stock</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">If resources or the visitors' experiences are adversely impacted, pets and or stock animals may be limited or prohibited in canyons requiring permits.No unauthorized use of existing corrals. <p>Areas for Day Stock Use Only Bullet Canyon from Grand Gulch to Jailhouse Ruin. Two miles upstream Fish Canyon from the confluence with Owl Canyon, McLoyd Canyon to impassable pour-off, and Owl Canyon to Nevill's Arch.</p> <p>Pets No limit or fees for pets. All pets must be collared, leashed, and under human control at all times. No pets are allowed in Slickhorn Canyon or below Collins Canyon in Grand Gulch. Pets are not allowed in or at any alcoves, rock art sites, or ruins. Pets must not harass or harm wildlife. Pets must not harass visitors and other visitors' pets. Pets are not allowed to swim in springs, pot holes, or other natural water sources. Pet waste must be buried in a shallow hole away from trails, campsites, cultural sites, and natural water sources.</p> <p>Stock (horses, llamas, goats, etc.) All commercial and private stock use requires a permit. Within the Grand Gulch NHD 1 stock trip at any one time would be allowed in the area, including day use. Other Cedar Mesa canyons allow 1 overnight stock trip at any one time, and</p>

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

<p>95, Road Canyon, Lime Creek Canyon, Johns Canyon, and Arch Canyon.</p> <p>Areas Closed to Stock Use</p> <p>Grand Gulch below Collins Canyon, all the Slickhorn Canyons, Mule Canyons north of U-95, Bullet Canyon above Jailhouse Ruin, Fish Creek Canyon from 2 miles upstream from Fish Creek and Owl Creek confluence, and Owl Canyon above Nevill's Arch.</p> <p>Use Limitations</p> <p>Stock use, both day and overnight, is subject to the provisions of the Grand Gulch Plateau Cultural and Recreation Management Plan, which allows for no more than 1 overnight stock party at a time in any canyon on Cedar Mesa. However, Grand Gulch is limited to only one stock trip at any time, day or overnight. In the other canyon systems on Cedar Mesa, day stock use is not restricted at this time. The BLM would monitor day use, and reserves the right to implement a day-use allocation and reservation future date if the impacts of day-use visitation warrant.</p> <p>Group Size</p> <p>Overnight and day use in the Grand Gulch Primitive area and other Cedar Mesa Canyons restricted to 12 individuals and 10 animals (pack and/or saddle).</p> <p>Feed</p> <p>Stock users would be required to take all feed (non-germinating, weed free) necessary to sustain their animals while on the trip.</p> <p>Loose Herding</p> <p>Loose herding of pack and saddle stock is prohibited. All stock must be under physical control. When tethered, all stock must be at least 200 feet away from any water source and archaeological sites and their surrounding benches.</p> <p>No New Trails</p> <p>No new trails would be established for stock use. Use would be restricted to existing trails and routes in areas open to recreational stock use.</p>					<p>unlimited day use.</p> <p>Overnight Stock Use Areas</p> <p>Kane Gulch, Collins Canyon, Government Trail, Grand Gulch from Kane Gulch to Collins Canyon, Fish Creek Canyon from Comb Wash to confluence with Owl Canyon, Mule Canyon South of U-95, Road Canyon, Lime Creek Canyon, Johns Canyon, and Arch Canyon.</p> <p>Areas Closed to Stock Use</p> <p>Grand Gulch below Collins Canyon, all the Slickhorn Canyons, Mule Canyons north of U-95, Bullet Canyon above Jailhouse Ruin, Fish Creek Canyon from 2 miles upstream from Fish Creek and Owl Creek confluence, and Owl Canyon above Nevill's Arch.</p> <p>Use Limitations</p> <p>Stock use, both day and overnight, is subject to the provisions of the Grand Gulch Plateau Cultural and Recreation Management Plan, which allows for no more than 1 overnight stock party at a time in any canyon on Cedar Mesa. However, Grand Gulch is limited to only one stock trip at any time, day or overnight. Stock day use would be limited to 1 party per day per trailhead in all canyons requiring permits (except Grand Gulch and McLoyd). The BLM would monitor day use, and reserves the right to implement a day-use allocation and reservation system at a future date, if the impacts of day-use visitation warrant.</p> <p>Group Size</p> <p>Overnight and day use in the Grand Gulch Primitive area and other Cedar Mesa Canyons restricted to 12 individuals and 8 animals (pack and/or saddle).</p> <p>Feed</p> <p>Stock users would be required to take all feed (non-germinating, weed free) necessary to sustain their animals while on the trip.</p> <p>Loose Herding</p> <p>Loose herding of pack and saddle stock is prohibited. All stock must be under physical control. When tethered, all stock must be at least 200 feet away from any water source and archaeological sites and their surrounding benches.</p> <p>No New Trails</p> <p>No new trails would be established for stock use. Use would be restricted to existing trails and routes in areas open to recreational stock use.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

<u>Mesa Top Day Use</u> There is no allocation or group size.	<u>Mesa Top Day Use</u> No allocations on group numbers. Group size limited to 10 people for both private and commercial use, both within and outside of the WSA.	<u>Mesa Top Day Use</u> No allocations on group numbers. Group size limited to 12 people for both private and commercial use, both within and outside of the WSA. No group size limits for groups going to the following areas: Mule Canyon Ruin, Kane Gulch Ranger Station, Salvation Knoll, and other sites as identified.	<u>Mesa Top Day Use</u> No allocations on group numbers. Group size limit of 12 people for private and commercial use within the WSA and 25 people outside of the WSA. No group size limits for groups going to the following areas: Mule Canyon Ruin, Kane Gulch Ranger Station, Salvation Knoll, and other sites as identified.	<u>Mesa Top Day Use</u> No allocations on group numbers. Group size limited to 10 people for private and commercial use, both within and outside of the WSA.	<u>Mesa Top Day Use</u> No allocations on group numbers. Group size limited to 24 people for both private and commercial use, both within and outside of the WSA. No group size limits for groups going to the following areas: Mule Canyon Ruin, Kane Gulch Ranger Station, Salvation Knoll, and other sites as identified.
<u>Mesa Top Camping</u> Cedar Mesa is open to dispersed camping. There is no allocation, no group size. No permits or fees required for private or commercial camping.	<u>Mesa Top Camping</u> Designated primitive and vehicle campsites. Group size limited to 12 people for both private and commercial use. Closure of campsites impacting cultural sites. Overnight campers required to remove their human waste. 14-day camping limit within any 28 consecutive days, with the options of reducing the number of days or closing campsites if impacts occur.	<u>Mesa Top Camping</u> Designated primitive and vehicle campsites. Designated campsites for large groups (12 to 24 people). Group size limited to 24 people for both private and commercial use. Closure of campsites impacting cultural sites. Overnight campers required to remove their human waste. 14-day camping limit within any 28 consecutive days, with the options of reducing the number of days or closing campsites if impacts occur.	<u>Mesa Top Camping</u> No designated campsites for groups under 24. Designated campsites for groups of 24 and larger. No group size limit. Closure of campsites impacting cultural sites. Campsite facility development as needed (fire grates, picnic tables, toilets, etc.). 14-day camping limit within any 28 consecutive days, with the options of reducing the number of days or closing campsites if impacts occur.	<u>Mesa Top Camping</u> Designated primitive and vehicle campsites. Group size limited to 12 people for both private and commercial use. Closure of campsites impacting cultural sites. Overnight campers required to remove their human waste. 14-day camping limit within any 28 consecutive days, with the options of reducing the number of days or closing campsites if impacts occur.	<u>Mesa Top Camping</u> Designated primitive and vehicle campsites. Designated campsites for large groups (20 to 24 people). Group size limited to 24 people for both private and commercial use. Closure of campsites impacting cultural sites. Overnight campers required to remove their human waste. 14-day camping limit within any 28 consecutive days, with the options of reducing the number of days or closing campsites if impacts occur.
<u>In Canyon Private/Commercial Day Use</u> Private No limits on numbers of parties per day per trailhead for day use. Group size limited to 12. Commercial Group size limited to 12. No limits on number of parties per day per trailhead. Revise The Grand Gulch Plateau Cultural and Recreation Area Management Plan. Advanced permit required through Monticello PA.	<u>In Canyon Private/Commercial Day Use</u> Private Limit of 10 people per day per trailhead. Group size limited to 10. Mandatory permits during high-use season. Commercial Group size limited to 10. One commercial group every other day per trailhead. Limit commercial use or close areas to commercial use as necessary to protect cultural and other resources. Advanced permit required through Monticello PA.	<u>In Canyon Private/Commercial Day Use</u> Private Limit of 12 people per day per trailhead. Group size limited to 12. A limited day use permit system implemented as necessary to protect cultural and other resources. Commercial Group size limited to 12. One commercial group per day per trailhead. Implement additional restrictions on group size and visitor frequency (based on monitoring of impact) as necessary to protect cultural or other resources. Advanced permit required through Monticello PA.	<u>In Canyon Private/Commercial Day Use</u> Same as Alternative C with the following exception limiting 2 commercial groups per trailhead per day.	<u>In Canyon Private/Commercial Day Use</u> Private Limit of 10 people per day per trailhead. Group size limited to 10. Mandatory permits during high use season. Commercial Group size limited to 10. One commercial group every other day per trailhead. Limit commercial use or close areas to commercial use as necessary to protect cultural and other resources. Advanced permit required through Monticello PA.	<u>In Canyon Private/Commercial Day Use</u> Private Limit of 12 people per day per trailhead. Group size limited to 12. A limited day use permit system implemented as necessary to protect cultural and other resources. Commercial Group size limited to 12. One commercial group per day per trailhead. Implement additional restrictions on group size and visitor frequency (based on monitoring of impact) as necessary to protect cultural or other resources. Advanced permit required through Monticello PA.
<u>In Canyon Overnight Camping</u> Pack it in, pack it out. All cans, trash, organic garbage, and burnable refuse including toilet paper must be carried out. Liquid garbage may be discarded 200 feet	<u>In Canyon Overnight Camping</u> Same as Alternative A, except for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designated campsites for groups up to 4, up to 8, and up to 10 people, and groups with stock. In-canyon camping could be 	<u>In Canyon Overnight Camping</u> Same as Alternative A, except for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designated campsites for large groups of 8–12 people, and for groups with stock animals. Groups of 1–7 people would not 	<u>In Canyon Overnight Camping</u> Same as Alternative A, except for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dispersed camping for groups of 1–7. Designated campsites for groups of 8–12 and groups with stock. 	<u>In Canyon Overnight Camping</u> Same as Alternative A, except for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designated campsites for groups up to 4, up to 8, and up to 10 people, and groups with stock. In-canyon camping could be 	<u>In Canyon Overnight Camping</u> Management prescriptions are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pack it in, pack it out. All cans, trash, organic garbage, and burnable refuse including toilet paper must be carried out. Liquid garbage may be discarded 200 feet away from water sources. Dish water must be strained and discarded 200 feet

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

<p>away from water sources. Dish water must be strained and discarded 200 feet from camps, trails, and water sources.</p> <p>No swimming or bathing is allowed in the pools.</p> <p>Commercial allocation would be 30% of the Cedar Mesa permitted use.</p> <p>Group size limited to 12 people for overnight use. Groups of 8 or more must obtain an advanced reservation.</p> <p>Camping permitted in well-used campsites only. No new campsites may be created. No party may spend more than 2 consecutive nights at campsites near Junction Ruin, Turkey Pen Ruin, Jailhouse Ruin, and the mouth of Bullet Canyon.</p> <p>No camping allowed at any ruins, rock art sites, or alcoves, nor on the bench area surrounding Split Level Ruin. Backpacker camping is not allowed within 1 mile of the San Juan River in either Grand Gulch or Slickhorn Canyon.</p> <p>No fires allowed in any of the Cedar Mesa Canyons, including Grand Gulch.</p> <p>Latrines or shallow cat-holes for human waste disposal should be dug 4–6" deep and covered with soil. Pack out toilet paper, do not burn it. Burial of human waste prohibited within one mile of the San Juan River. Disposal of human waste at least 200 feet from water sources or dry creek beds.</p> <p>Camping, bathing, and dish washing must be at least 200 feet from water sources or dry creek beds. Soap may not be used in water sources, even if biodegradable.</p> <p>Commercial trips limited to 1 commercial trip per day per trailhead.</p>	<p>limited to certain designated areas if resource or cultural damage occurs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• If human waste becomes a public safety and/or resource issue, a requirement to carry out waste may be implemented. <p>Private</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Private group size limited to 6 people per day per trailhead.• Total caps on visitor numbers for each trailhead are shown below. <p>Commercial</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Commercial guides would be required to meet all pertinent state requirements.• Commercial group size limited to 10 people per day per trailhead.• Total caps on visitor numbers for each trailhead are shown below.	<p>have designated campsites and would camp in dispersed campsites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• In canyon camping could be limited to certain designated areas if resource or cultural damage occurs.• If human waste becomes a problem, carrying out waste may become implemented.• Total caps on visitor numbers for each trailhead are shown below. Caps on visitor numbers or group size may be modified as necessary to protect resources. <p>Private</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Private group size limited to 8 people per day per trailhead. <p>Commercial</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Commercial group size limited to 12 people per day per trailhead.• One commercial group per trailhead per day.• Commercial guides are required to meet all pertinent state guidelines.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• If human waste becomes a problem, carrying out waste may be implemented.• Total caps on visitor numbers for each trailhead are shown below. Caps on visitor numbers or group size may be modified as necessary to protect resources. <p>Private</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Private group size limited to 12 people per day per trailhead.• If no commercial group allocation, 12 additional permits would be available. <p>Commercial</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Group size limited to 12 people per day per trailhead.• Commercial guides would be required to meet all pertinent state requirements.• Commercial trips would be limited to one commercial trip per day per trailhead.	<p>limited to certain designated areas if resource or cultural damage occurs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• If human waste becomes a public safety and/or resource issue, a requirement to carry out waste may be implemented. <p>Private</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Private group size limited to 6 people per day per trailhead.• Total caps on visitor numbers for each trailhead are shown below. <p>Commercial</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Commercial guides would be required to meet all pertinent state requirements.• Commercial group size limited to 10 people per day per trailhead.• Total caps on visitor numbers for each trailhead are shown below.	<p>from camps, trails, and water sources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No swimming or bathing is allowed in the pools.• Commercial allocation would be 30% of the Cedar Mesa permitted use.• Designated campsites for large groups of 8–12 people, and for groups with stock animals.• Groups of 1–7 people would not have designated campsites and would camp in dispersed campsites.• In canyon camping could be limited to certain designated areas if resource or cultural damage occurs.• If human waste becomes a problem, a requirement to carry out waste may become implemented.• Total caps on visitor numbers for each trailhead are shown below. Caps on visitor numbers or group size may be modified as necessary to protect resources. <p>Private</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Private group size limited to 8 people per day per trailhead. <p>Commercial</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Commercial group size limited to 12 people per day per trailhead.• One commercial group per trailhead per day.• Commercial guides are required to meet all pertinent state guidelines.
---	---	---	---	---	--

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

Trailhead Allocations Total overnight visitors per day: Kane 26 Bullet 22 Government 12 Collins 22 Fish/Owl 26 Road Canyon 22 Lime Creek 22 Mule Canyons 22 Slickhorn Canyons 22	Trailhead Allocations Total overnight visitors per day: Kane 16 Bullet 16 Government 16 Collins 16 Fish/Owl 16 Road Canyon 16 Lime Creek 16 Mule canyons 16 Slickhorn Canyons 16	Trailhead Allocations Total overnight visitors per day: Kane 20 Bullet 20 Government 20 Collins 20 Fish/Owl 20 Road Canyon 20 Lime Creek 20 Mule Canyons 20 Slickhorn Canyons 20 If commercial cap limits are not met on a given day, additional private visitors would be allowed provided the overall cap of 20 people per trailhead is not exceeded.	Trailhead Allocations Total overnight visitors per day: Kane 24 Bullet 24 Government 24 Collins 24 Fish/Owl 24 Road Canyon 24 Lime Creek 24 Mule Canyons 24 Slickhorn Canyons 24 If commercial cap limits are not met on a given day, additional private visitors would be allowed provided the overall cap of 24 people per trailhead is not exceeded.	Trailhead Allocations Total overnight visitors per day: Kane 16 Bullet 16 Government 16 Collins 16 Fish/Owl 16 Road Canyon 16 Lime Creek 16 Mule canyons 16 Slickhorn Canyons 16	Trailhead Allocations Total overnight visitors per day: Kane 20 Bullet 20 Government 20 Collins 20 Fish/Owl 20 Road Canyon 20 Lime Creek 20 Mule Canyons 20 Slickhorn Canyons 20 If commercial cap limits are not met on a given day, additional private visitors would be allowed provided the overall cap of 20 people per trailhead is not exceeded.
There are no Recreation Management Zones within the Grand Gulch Plateau SRMA or the Cedar Mesa C-SRMA under Alternatives A–E. However, under the Cultural Resources section of this Chapter, the Grand Gulch NHD is identified as a Cultural Special Management Area and provides management prescriptions for recreation use to protect cultural resources. These management prescriptions have been carried forward from the range of alternatives and included in the Cedar Mesa SRMA Grand Gulch NHD Recreation Management Zone for the Proposed Plan.					Cedar Mesa SRMA Grand Gulch NHD Recreation Management Zone (RMZ) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• This area is a RMZ within the SRMA due to its high level of backcountry use and the potential to impact the high density world renowned cultural resources in this area. Restrictions and management prescriptions are intended to minimize conflict between this use and cultural resources.• Grand Gulch National Historic District is within a WSA; WSAs are managed under the IMP.• In addition to the management prescriptions described above for the Cedar Mesa SRMA, Grand Gulch National Historic District (37,388 acres) would be managed with these prescriptions:• Unavailable for geophysical activities.• Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.• Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products, except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.• Campfires limited to mesa tops only (no campfires in the canyon).• Available for livestock use, except Grand Gulch Canyon and associated tributaries, below Kane Gulch fence to the confluence with the San Juan River (approximately 16,316 acres).• Closed to OHV use.• Designate trails and camping areas as necessary to protect cultural resources.• If cultural or natural resources or the visitors' experiences are impacted, pets and or stock animals may be limited or prohibited in canyons requiring permits.• Non-motorized habitat improvements, watershed improvements, vegetation treatments, including aerial seeding, hand reseeding, planting seedlings, and control of invasive non-native species allowed as long as they do not impact cultural resources based on a site-specific analysis, and are consistent with the IMP.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Limitations on numbers of trips may be implemented if cultural resources are impacted.
<p>There are no Recreation Management Zones within the Grand Gulch Plateau SRMA or the Cedar Mesa C-SRMA under Alternatives A–E. However, under the Cultural Resources section of this Chapter, Comb Ridge is identified as a Cultural Special Management Area and provides management prescriptions for recreation use to protect cultural resources. These management prescriptions have been carried forward from the range of alternatives and included in the Cedar Mesa SRMA Comb Ridge Recreation Management Zone for the Proposed Plan.</p>	<p><u>Cedar Mesa SRMA Comb Ridge Recreation Management Zone</u></p> <p>This area is a RMZ within the SRMA due to easy vehicular accessibility, high level of visitation and popularity, and density of significant cultural ruins and rock art. Specific management is needed to resolve conflicts between recreation use and protection of cultural resources. The objective is to manage for heritage tourism and traditional cultural values in a regulated manner.</p> <p>The Cedar Mesa SRMA limitations described above for Mesa Top Day Use, Mesa Top Camping, In Canyon Private/Commercial Day Use, and In Canyon Permitted Overnight Camping do not apply to the Comb Ridge MZ.</p> <p>The following management prescriptions would apply in this RMZ:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Designate as VRM Class II• Unavailable for geophysical exploration• ROW avoidance area• Closed to disposal of mineral materials• Oil and gas leasing subject to NSO• OHVs limited to designated routes• Campfires allowed at designated sites only• Private and commercial group size limited to 12• Comb Wash campground would be developed• In camp areas without toilet, human waste must be packed out• Closed to dispersed camping• Camping limited to designated camp areas and campgrounds, with designated access routes and parking• A permit system would be established for day and overnight use if necessary to protect cultural resources• Trails from parking areas to cultural sites would be designated and signed• Parking for day use would be limited to designated areas• In the Butler Wash area, private group size would be limited to 8 and primitive camp sites would be designated <p>Also in Butler Wash, if necessary, it would be managed as part of the existing Cedar Mesa permits and regulation system, including regulations and permit fees. Groups would view a low impact video at Kane Gulch or Sand Island Ranger Stations when obtaining a permit.</p>
<p>There are no Recreation Management Zones within the Grand Gulch Plateau SRMA or the Cedar Mesa C-SRMA under Alternatives A–E. However, under the Cultural Resources section of this Chapter, the McLoyd Canyon–Moon House areas has been identified as a Cultural Special Management Area and provides management prescriptions for recreation use to protect cultural resources. These management prescriptions have been carried forward from the range of alternatives and included in the Cedar Mesa SRMA McLoyd-Moon House Recreation Management Zone for the Proposed Plan.</p>	<p><u>Cedar Mesa SRMA McLoyd Canyon–Moon House Recreation Management Zone</u></p> <p>McLoyd Canyon–Moon House (1,607 acres) is a RMZ within the SRMA due to its accessibility and the unique architecture of the Moon House ruin. From a scientific perspective, Moon House ruin is world renowned, unique to the region, and is a significant cultural treasure. Restrictions and management prescriptions are intended to minimize conflict between recreational use and cultural resources.</p>

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

	<p><u>The Cedar Mesa SRMA limitations described above for Mesa Top Day Use, Mesa Top Camping, In Canyon Private/Commercial Day Use, and In Canyon Permitted Overnight Camping do not apply to the McLoyd Canyon–Moon House RMZ.</u></p> <p>This RMZ occurs within the Fish Creek Canyon WSA; and is managed under the IMP. In addition to this management the following prescriptions would apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Closed to OHV use.• Develop a cultural resource management plan (CRMP) for McLoyd Canyon–Moon House.• Public access limited via a permit system for day visits.• No more than 36 people allowed to visit Moon House per day. Limitations on visitation may change based on site monitoring of impacts of visitation.• One commercial group per day. The number of people is included in the day use number of 36.• Access to the interior corridor of Moon House ruin is limited to 4 people at any one time.• Visitors would not be allowed to enter the Moon Room and adjoining rooms within Moon House ruin.• Human waste must be packed out.• Camping limited only to the designated primitive camp and park area west of the Snow Flat Road. Camping prohibited outside of this primitive camp area.• Hiking to Moon House site is limited to the designated trail. Hiking to other sites in the RMZ may also be limited to designated trails if determined necessary.• RMZ is closed to pack animals and pets.• Campfires not allowed.• Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products, including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.• McLoyd Canyon is closed to overnight use from the head of the canyon to UTM: 607100E, 4143495N.• Utah State Section Township 39S Range 19E, Section 2, is proposed for acquisition.• Develop a site stewardship program to monitor site and possibly develop guided tours.
Dark Canyon SRMA	
<p>GOALS AND OBJECTIVES</p> <p>Provide outstanding recreational opportunities and visitor experiences, while protecting natural and cultural resource values through integrated management between the BLM, USFS and NPS.</p> <p>Provide a primitive, roadless, and undeveloped recreational experience in an essentially unmodified natural environment. Continue to provide a scenic backcountry experience of expansive views from within one of the deepest canyon systems in the region.</p> <p>By the year 2012, manage this SRMA to provide opportunities for visitors to realize personal development and growth, enhanced lifestyle increased local tourism revenue and maintenance of distinct recreation setting character, providing no fewer than 80% of responding visitors and impacted community residents at least a moderate realization of these benefits: (i.e., 3.0 on a probability scale where 1 = not at all, 2 = somewhat, 3 = moderate, 4 = total realization).</p>	

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ALTERNATIVES Create and allocate an interagency permit and fee system for these canyons as necessary to preserve resources and the visitor experience.					
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ACTION ALTERNATIVES The existing Canyon Basins SRMA would be separated into three new SRMAs: the Dark Canyon SRMA, the Indian Creek SRMA and the Beef Basin SRMA. Management prescriptions for the Dark Canyon SRMA are described below by alternative. The Dark Canyon SRMA would include canyon rims and bottoms for Dark Canyon, Gypsum Canyon, Bowdie Canyon, Lean To Canyon, Palmer Canyon, Lost Canyon, Black Steer Canyon, Young's Canyon, and Fable Valley Canyon. Trailheads and associated parking/camping areas are included within the SRMA boundaries where the canyons are specified as the SRMA. The Dark Canyon WSA overlays the SRMA and would be managed according to the IMP. The SRMA would be unavailable for livestock grazing in the canyons and available to livestock grazing on mesa tops. An Interagency Management Plan would be written in coordination with the contiguous NPS and USFS agencies.					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Note: In the current RMP, this area is part of the Canyon Basin's SRMA. The Canyon Basin (214,390) SRMA (Map 36) would include both the proposed Dark Canyon SRMA and the proposed Indian Creek SRMA, and would be managed according to the following stipulations: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No group size limit• Commercial permits required• No private permits required• No group limits• No permit fees• No interagency permitting• Little ranger presence• Fires permitted• Dogs permitted• Open dispersed camping permitted• Vehicle use• Closed to OHV use	Dark Canyon (30,820 acres) (Map 37) would be managed as a SRMA with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Group size limit would be limited to 10 people for private groups, 12 people for commercial groups.• Implementation of an allocated permit and fee system.• One commercial trip allowed per week.• Fifteen total private users per day. This number could be altered depending upon future visitor impacts.• Camping in designated sites only.• Campfires limited to mesa tops.• Human waste must be packed out.• Unavailable for private and/or commercial collection of woodland products, including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.• No pets would be allowed.• Closed to OHV use	Dark Canyon (30,820 acres) (Map 38) would be managed as a SRMA with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Group size would be limited to 15 people for private and commercial groups.• Three commercial trips would be allowed per week.• Twenty total private users allowed per day. This number may be altered, depending upon future visitor impacts.• If and where necessary, camping would be restricted to designated sites only.• Campfires would be allowed on mesa tops (fire pan required); cook stoves only in canyons.• Unavailable for private and/or commercial collection of woodland products, except for the on-site collection of dead wood for campfires on mesa tops.• If human waste becomes a problem, carrying out waste may be implemented in canyon.• Pets would be allowed on leash and under physical control.• Closed to OHV use	Dark Canyon (30,820 acres) (Map 39) would be managed as a SRMA with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Group size limited to 15 people for private and commercial.• Seven commercial trips would be allowed per week.• Dispersed camping would be allowed in canyon and on mesa top.• Campfires would be allowed on mesa tops and in canyons (fire pan required).• Unavailable for private and/or commercial collection of woodland product use, except ro on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.• Pets would be allowed on leash and under physical control.• OHV use limited to designated routes	Dark Canyon (30,820 acres) (Map 37) would be managed as a SRMA with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Group size limit would be limited to 10 people for private groups, 12 people for commercial groups.• An allocated permit and fee system would be implemented.• One commercial trip would be allowed per week.• Fifteen total private users would be allowed per day. This number could be altered depending upon future visitor impacts.• Camping would be allowed in designated sites only.• Campfires would be limited to mesa tops.• Human waste must be packed out.• Unavailable for private and/or commercial collection of woodland products including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.• No pets would be allowed.• Closed to OHV use	Dark Canyon (30,820 acres) (Map 40) would be managed as a SRMA with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Group size would be limited to 18 people for private and commercial.• Three commercial trips would be allowed per week.• Up to twenty total private users allowed per day. This number may be altered depending upon future visitor impacts.• If and where necessary, camping would be restricted to designated sites only.• Campfires would be allowed on mesa tops) cook stoves only in canyons.• Unavailable for private and/or commercial collection of woodland product use, except for the on-site collection of dead wood for campfires on mesa tops.• If human waste becomes a problem, carrying out waste may be implemented in canyon.• Pets would be allowed on leash and under physical control.• Closed to OHV use.
Indian Creek SRMA					
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES Provide outstanding recreational opportunities and visitor experiences while protecting natural and cultural resource values through integrated management between the BLM, NPS, State of Utah, and the Nature Conservancy. Provide for premier rock climbing experiences, outstanding OHV opportunities, scenic vistas, cultural site interpretation at Newspaper Rock, destination camping areas, and a gateway to Canyonlands National Park. By the year 2012, manage this SRMA to provide opportunities for visitors to realize personal development and growth, enhanced lifestyle increased local tourism revenue and maintenance of distinct recreation setting character, providing no fewer than 80% of responding visitors and impacted community residents at least a moderate realization of these benefits: (i.e., 3.0 on a probability scale where 1 = not at all, 2 = somewhat, 3 = moderate, 4 = total realization).					
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ACTION ALTERNATIVES The existing Canyon Basins SRMA would be separated into three new SRMAs: the Indian Creek SRMA, the Dark Canyon SRMA, and the Beef Basin SRMA. Management prescriptions for the Indian Creek SRMA are described below by alternative. Indian Creek (89,271 acres) would be managed as an SRMA. Indian Creek SRMA includes all of the Indian Creek and Bridger Jack Mesa WSAs and Shay Canyon, Lavender Mesa and Indian Creek ACECs. WSAs are managed under the IMP and ACECs would be managed in accordance with management prescriptions					

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

<p>outlined in this plan.</p> <p>Indian Creek SRMA boundary would match the boundary for the Indian Creek Corridor Plan and EA UT-090-00-47 (BLM 2005). Management of the Indian Creek Corridor would be in conformance with the decisions outlined in the Indian Creek Corridor Plan, which includes the following guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Camping would be prohibited in the Indian Creek riparian corridor from Newspaper Rock to approximately 1 mile downstream of the Dugout Ranch.• Camp sites would be removed from the Newspaper Rock area and rehabilitated.• A picnic area would be constructed adjacent to the Newspaper Rock parking area.• Camping along the Bridger Jack Mesa Bench would be limited to designated sites.• A new campground called Shay Mountain Vista Campground would be constructed.• The area would be unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products, including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. Campers must bring in their own wood for campfires.• Campfires would be restricted to fire rings where fire rings are available. In dispersed camping areas, where fire rings are not available, fires would be subject to "Leave No Trace" standards. No campfires would be allowed in the Lavender Mesa ACEC.• Rock-climbing routes in conflict with cultural sites would be closed.• Camping fees would be charged if deemed necessary to provide needed facilities.• Parking areas would be developed.• Additional camping stipulations and regulations could be implemented if monitoring data shows this is necessary.• If new climbing routes are established, the BLM may designate a footpath to access the base of the climb to protect wildlife/raptors.					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Canyon Basins SRMA (214,390 acres) (Map 36) Dispersed camping would be allowed in Indian Creek Corridor. The Canyon Basins SRMA would include: the Indian Creek SRMA, the Dark Canyon SRMA, and the Beef Basin SRMA (proposed in Alternatives B & E and the Proposed Plan)	Indian Creek SRMA (89,271 acres) (Map 37) Dispersed camping would not be allowed in the Indian Creek Corridor. Camping would only be allowed in designated sites. Within Shay Canyon portion of this SRMA, the ACEC prescriptions require that hiking be limited to designated trails, except within the side canyons, closed to all camping and campfires are not allowed.	Indian Creek SRMA (89,271 acres) (Map 38) Dispersed camping would be allowed in the Indian Creek Corridor, except within the following designated dispersed camping zones that have been established: Bridger Jack Mesa, Indian Creek Falls, and Creek Pasture. Camping within these zones is limited to designated sites. Within Shay Canyon portion of this SRMA, the ACEC prescriptions require that hiking be limited to designated trails, except within the side canyons, closed to all camping and campfires are not allowed.	Same as Alternative C (Map 39).	Same as Alternative B (Map 37). Within Shay Canyon portion of this SRMA, the ACEC prescriptions require that hiking be limited to designated trails, except within the side canyons, closed to all camping and campfires are not allowed.	Indian Creek SRMA (89,271 acres) (Map 40) Dispersed camping would be allowed in the Indian Creek Corridor, except within the established designated camping zones: Bridger Jack Mesa, Indian Creek Falls, and Creek Pasture. Camping within these zones is limited to designated sites. Where dispersed vehicle camping is allowed, it would only be allowed in previously disturbed areas within 150 feet of designated routes. Within Shay Canyon portion of this SRMA, the ACEC prescriptions require that hiking be limited to designated trails, except within the side canyons, closed to all camping and campfires are not allowed.
White Canyon SRMA					
<p>GOALS AND OBJECTIVES</p> <p>Provide outstanding recreational opportunities and visitor experiences, while protecting natural and cultural resource values through integrated management between the BLM and NPS (including the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area and Natural Bridges National Monument).</p> <p>Provide a spectacular canyoneering recreational experience in a popular, world renowned and easily accessible slot canyon; including, backcountry hiking and backpacking, remote camping, cultural site visitation and exploration.</p> <p>By the year 2012, manage this SRMA to provide opportunities for visitors to realize personal development and growth, enhanced lifestyle increased local tourism revenue and maintenance of distinct recreation setting character, providing no fewer than 80% of responding visitors and impacted community residents at least a moderate realization of these benefits: (i.e., 3.0 on a probability scale where 1 = not at all, 2 = somewhat, 3 = moderate, 4 = total realization).</p> <p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ALTERNATIVES</p> <p>Trailheads and associated parking/camping areas are included within the SRMA boundaries where the canyons are specified as the SRMA. The White Canyon SRMA is defined as from rim to rim.</p> <p>Canyons excluded from woodland product use including on-site collection of dead wood for campfire.</p> <p>The Cheesebox Canyon WSA overlays a portion of the White Canyon SRMA; this area would be managed in accordance with the IMP.</p>					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
This area was not identified as an SRMA in the 1991 San Juan Resource Area RMP, as amended. These lands are managed	White Canyon (2,828 acres) (Map 37) would be managed as a SRMA with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A backcountry allocated permit	White Canyon (2,828 acres) (Map 38) would be managed as a SRMA with the same management prescriptions as Alternative B,	White Canyon (2,828 acres) (Map 39) would be managed as a SRMA with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No permit system would be	Same as Alternative B, except for: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• VRM Class I• OHV use closed	White Canyon (2,828 acres) (Map 40) would be managed as a SRMA with the same management prescriptions as Alternative B, except for the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• If human waste becomes a problem, carrying out waste may

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

according to the 1991 San Juan RMP prescriptions. Designated as VRM Class I OHV use limited to designated routes Unavailable or NSO to oil and gas leasing.	system would be established as necessary to protect resources. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fire pans would be required for mesa tops.• Campfires would not be allowed.• Human waste must be packed out.• Designated as VRM Class I and II• OHV use closed and limited to designated routes• Unavailable and CSU to oil and gas leasing.	except for the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• If human waste becomes a problem, carrying out waste may be implemented in the canyon.• Cook stoves would only be allowed in canyons.• Campfires would not be allowed in the canyons.• Designated as VRM Class I and II• OHV use closed and limited to designated routes• Unavailable and CSU to oil and gas leasing.	required. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• If human waste becomes a problem, carrying out waste may become implemented in the canyon.• Campfires would be allowed on mesa tops and canyons (fire pan required).• Designated as VRM Class I and III• OHV use limited to designated routes• Unavailable and CSU to oil and gas leasing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Unavailable to oil and gas leasing.	be implemented in the canyon. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cook stoves would only be allowed in canyons.• Campfires would not be allowed in the canyons.• Designated as VRM Class I and II.• OHV use closed and limited to designated routes• Unavailable and CSU to oil and gas leasing.
Tank Bench CSMA					Tank Bench SRMA
There is no Tank Bench SRMA under Alternatives A–E in the Draft RMP EIS. However, under the Cultural Resources section of this Chapter, the Tank Bench Cultural Special Management Area is identified and outlines management prescriptions for recreation use to protect cultural resources. These management prescriptions have been carried forward from the range of alternatives and included in the White Canyon SRMA for the Proposed Plan.					GOALS AND OBJECTIVES Provide outstanding recreational opportunities and visitor experiences while protecting natural and cultural resource values. Tank Bench SRMA provides easy access to a spectacular complex of cultural sites. Provide a safe, natural, well-designed accessible recreational experience for all visitors to enjoy the world renowned cultural resources and scenic values. Use visitor information and interpretation as a primary tool to protect sensitive resources, discourage vandalism, and encourage visitor appreciation of public lands. The BLM would complete a joint recreation/cultural resources management plan (CRMP) for this area based on the RMP.
					Tank Bench (2,646 acres) (Map 40) would be managed as a SRMA with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Dispersed hiking allowed; not limited to designated trails.• Area would remain open to domestic pets and pack animals but use may be limited if damage is occurring to cultural resources.• Commercial group size limited to 12 people.• Closed to OHV use.• Livestock use would continue but it may be limited if cultural resources are impacted.• Available for range, wildlife habitat, watershed improvements, vegetation treatments, and other surface-disturbing land treatments if consistent with management plan objectives.• Campfires allowed.• Closed to private and/or commercial use of woodland products (including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires) with the exception of traditional Native American cultural uses, as long as they do not adversely impact other resource values.• Open to disposal of mineral materials and geophysical work.• Available for oil and gas leasing, subject to standard lease terms.• Manage as VRM Class III and IV.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

Beef Basin CSMA	Beef Basin SRMA
There is no Beef Basin SRMA under Alternatives A–E in the Draft RMP EIS. However, under the Cultural Resources section of this Chapter, the Beef Basin Cultural Special Management Area is identified and outlines management prescriptions for recreation use to protect cultural resources. These management prescriptions have been carried forward from the range of alternatives and included in the Beef Basin SRMA for the Proposed Plan.	<p>GOALS AND OBJECTIVES</p> <p>Provide outstanding recreational opportunities and visitor experiences while protecting natural and cultural resource values.</p> <p>Provides a popular, remote, backcountry driving experience with primitive camping and cultural site exploration opportunities. Management focus for the SRMA would be heritage tourism, traditional cultural values, and scientific research of prehistoric cultural landscapes.</p> <p>Provide a semiprimitive recreational experience for visitors to enjoy the world renowned cultural resources and scenic values. Use visitor information and interpretation as a primary tool to protect sensitive resources, discourage vandalism, and encourage visitor appreciation of public lands.</p> <p>The BLM would work with USFS and NPS to develop Interagency Recreation Commercial permits.</p> <p>The BLM would complete a joint recreation/cultural resources management plan (CRMP) for thei area based on the RMP.</p>
	<p>Beef Basin (20,302 acres) would be managed as a SRMA with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Available for private and/or commercial use of woodland products (including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires).• Open to disposal of mineral materials under special conditions.• Available for oil and gas leasing subject to timing limitations.• Livestock use would continue but may be limited if cultural resources are impacted.• Available for range, wildlife habitat, watershed improvements, vegetation treatments and other surface-disturbing land treatments if consistent with management plan objectives.• OHV use limited to designated routes.• A car campground would be developed in Ruin Park for primitive camping.• Primitive car camping areas would be designated in Middle Park, House Park, and along Beef Basin Loop Road, as well as other areas as necessary to control impacts to cultural resources.• Until primitive camping areas are designated in this area, dispersed vehicle camping would be allowed in previously disturbed areas within 150 feet of designated routes.• Campfires allowed and would be restricted to fire rings where fire rings are available. In dispersed camping areas, where fire rings are not available, fires would be subject to "Leave No Trace" standards.• Dispersed campsites that impact archaeological sites would be closed.• Cultural site visitation limited to designated trails.• Groups larger than 20 people total would be required to camp in designated areas. Human waste must be packed out.• Manage as VRM Class III

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

Extensive Recreation Management Areas (ERMAs)					
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES An ERMA is defined as an administrative unit where recreation management is only one of several management objectives, and where limited commitment of resources is required to provide extensive and unstructured types of recreation activities. Management associated with ERMAs is restricted to custodial actions only. ERMA lands would be managed to provide an undeveloped setting where visitors can disperse and recreate in a generally unregulated manner, as long as the use is consistent with other resource values. The objective of an ERMA is to provide dispersed recreational opportunities consistent with other resource objectives.					
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ALTERNATIVES Manage all lands within the PA, not within an SRMA (either initially or through subsequent action as described above) as the Monticello Extensive Recreation Management Area Any portions of an ERMA subject to other management prescriptions (i.e., ACEC, WSA, etc.) would be managed according to those prescriptions. Monitor ERMA to determine if more intensive recreational management is required to protect resource values and preserve the recreational experience. Encourage "Leave No Trace" and "Tread Lightly" principles throughout the ERMA. ERMA lands may be designated as SRMAs in the future based on intensity of use and would be analyzed through the plan amendment process. Minimal facilities may be constructed in the ERMA as needed to insure visitor health and safety, reduce user conflict, and protect resources.					
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ACTION ALTERNATIVES Mesa Top Camping (other than Cedar Mesa): <ul style="list-style-type: none">Limit the Bears Ears Road to designated camping only from the intersection of Highway 275 to the USFS boundary.Limit the Deer Flat Road to designated camping only from the first 4 miles from Highway 275.Coordinate with Glen Canyon National Recreation Area on building a campground at Muley Point or pursuing a land exchange for Muley Point in order to develop a campground.					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Not specified.	Dispersed vehicle camping would be allowed only in previously disturbed areas off of designated routes. If use is such that undue environmental impacts are taking place, the BLM would close and rehabilitate damaged areas.	Dispersed vehicle camping would be allowed within 150 feet of the centerline of designated route on each side. If use is such that undue environmental impacts are taking place, the BLM would close and rehabilitate damaged areas. Dispersed camping would be encouraged in previously disturbed areas.	Dispersed vehicle camping would be allowed 300 feet of the centerline of the road on each side. If use is such that undue environmental impacts are taking place, the BLM would close and rehabilitate damaged areas. Dispersed camping would be encouraged in previously disturbed areas.	Dispersed vehicle camping would be allowed only in previously disturbed areas off of designated routes, except in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics since the routes would be closed. If use is such that undue environmental impacts are taking place, the BLM would close and rehabilitate damaged areas.	Within the ERMA Dispersed vehicle camping would be allowed only in previously disturbed areas within 150 feet of designated routes (on each side of a centerline). If use is such that undue environmental impacts are taking place, BLM would close and rehabilitate damaged areas. This use would not include areas within WSAs (389,444 acres) or non-WSA areas with wilderness characteristics (88,871 acres), WSR corridors, ACECs, or T&E/special status species habitats. Where monitoring identifies resource impacts, future implementation level plans could consider designation of specific camp sites.
General Policy for Issuance and Management of Special Recreation Permits (SRPs) in SRMAs and ERMAs					
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ALTERNATIVES There would be no competitive mechanized or motorized events in WSAs in accordance with IMP. Under all alternatives, SRPs would be issued as a discretionary action as a means to help meet management objectives, control visitor use, protect recreational and natural resources, and provide for the health and safety of visitors. All SRPs would contain standard stipulations appropriate for the type of activity and may include additional stipulations (see Appendix E: Recreation) necessary to protect lands or resources, reduce user conflicts, or minimize health and safety concerns.					
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ACTION ALTERNATIVES SRPs would be used to manage different types of recreation associated with commercial uses, competitive events, organized groups, vending, and special areas. These recreation uses can include, for example, large group events, river guide services, and commercial recreation activities. The BLM would follow the 43 CFR 2930, October 1, 2004, the National Guidelines on Cost Recovery (Federal Register, Volume 67, October 1, 2002), and the Utah Special Recreation Permit Cost Recovery Policy (Utah IM 2004-036). In accordance with the BLM's Priorities for Recreation and Visitor Services Work Plan (May 2003, as amended), commercial SRPs would also be issued as a mechanism to provide a fair return for the commercial use of public lands.					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Commercial use of any kind requires a permit.	Criteria for requiring an SRP <ul style="list-style-type: none">Any commercial use.Day use organized group or event of more than 25 people in ERMA.	Criteria for requiring an SRP <ul style="list-style-type: none">Any commercial use.Non-mechanized/non-stock day use organized group or event of more than 50 people in ERMA.	Criteria for requiring an SRP <ul style="list-style-type: none">Any commercial use.Non-mechanized/non-stock day use organized group or event of more than 75 people in ERMA.	Criteria for requiring an SRP <ul style="list-style-type: none">Any commercial use.Day use organized group or event of more than 25 people in ERMA.	Criteria for requiring an SRP <ul style="list-style-type: none">Any commercial use.Non-mechanized/non-stock day use organized group or event of more than 50 people in ERMA.Non-mechanized/non-stock overnight with group or event of

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overnight with group or event of more than 15 people in ERMA. More than 15 motorized vehicles/OHVs on designated routes (does not include County B Roads or state and federal highways). More than 15 nonmotorized mechanized vehicles on designated routes (does not include County B Roads or state and federal highways). A group size of more than 10 riding and/or pack animals. Car camping with more than 10 vehicles or more than 50 people. Activities or events with the potential to conflict with existing resource management guidelines/prescriptions. Events with the potential for user conflict. Events that could impact public health and safety. Permitted use would only be allowed on designated routes consistent with the travel plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non-mechanized/non-stock overnight with group or event of more than 25 people in ERMA. More than 25 motorized vehicles/OHVs on designated routes (does not include County B Roads or state and federal highways). More than 25 nonmotorized mechanized vehicles on designated routes (does not include County B Roads or state and federal highways). A group size of more than 15 riding and/or pack animals. Car camping with more than 15 vehicles or more than 50 people. Activities or events with the potential to conflict with existing resource management guidelines/prescriptions. Events with the potential for user conflict. Events that could impact public health and safety. Permitted use would only be allowed on designated routes consistent with the travel plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non-mechanized/non-stock overnight with group or event of more than 50 people in ERMA. No limits on motorized vehicles/OHVs on designated routes (does not include County B Roads or state and federal highways). No limits on nonmotorized mechanized vehicles on designated routes (does not include County B Roads or state and federal highways). A group size of more than 20 riding and/or pack animals. Car camping with more than 20 vehicles groups or more than 50 people. Activities or events with the potential to conflict with existing resource management guidelines/prescriptions. Events with the potential for user conflict. Events that could impact public health and safety. Permitted use would only be allowed on designated routes consistent with the travel plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overnight with group or event of more than 15 people in ERMA. More than 15 motorized vehicles/OHVs on designated routes (does not include County B Roads or state and federal highways). More than 15 nonmotorized mechanized vehicles on designated routes (does not include County B Roads or state and federal highways). A group size of more than 10 riding and/or pack animals. Car camping with more than 10 vehicles or more than 50 people. Activities or events with the potential to conflict with existing resource management guidelines/prescriptions. Events with the potential for user conflict. Events that could impact public health and safety. Permitted use would only be allowed on designated routes consistent with the travel plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> more than 25 people in ERMA. More than 25 motorized vehicles/OHVs on designated routes (does not include County B Roads or state and federal highways). More than 25 nonmotorized mechanized vehicles on designated routes (does not include County B Roads or state and federal highways). A group size of more than 15 riding and/or pack animals. Car camping with more than 15 vehicles or more than 50 people. Activities or events with the potential to conflict with existing resource management guidelines/prescriptions. Events with the potential for user conflict. Events that could impact public health and safety. Permitted use would only be allowed on designated routes consistent with the travel plan.
<u>Commercial</u> Commercial use of any kind requires a permit.	<u>Commercial</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commercial motorized/mechanized events/tours allowed on designated routes, except in WSAs. Commercial use permits authorized in conjunction with organized events or when the use supports resource protection and management. Arch Canyon closed to OHV use. No commercial motorized or mechanized use in Arch Canyon. No commercial motorized/mechanized events/tours in crucial bighorn sheep lambing and rutting areas from April 1 to July 15 (lambing) and from October 15–December 31 	<u>Commercial</u> Managed the same as Alternative B, except for the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> OHV use in Arch Canyon limited to the designated route to the end of the state Section (T37S R20E Section 16) year-round. The canyon would be closed year-round from west boundary of the state Section to the end of the route at the National Forest boundary. No commercial motorized or mechanized events or tours in crucial bighorn sheep lambing and rutting areas from April 1 to June 15 (lambing) and from October 15–December 15 (rutting), unless it can be shown that the animals are not present in a specific project location or 	<u>Commercial</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commercial motorized/mechanized events/tours allowed on designated routes. Commercial use permits authorized to enhance recreational experiences and provide recreational opportunities to the public. OHV use in Arch Canyon limited to designated route year-round. No commercial motorized or mechanized events or tours in crucial bighorn sheep lambing and rutting areas from April 15 to May 15 (lambing), and from November 1–December 15 (rutting), unless it can be shown that the animals are not present 	<u>Commercial</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There would be no competitive mechanized or motorized events in lands with wilderness characteristics. Commercial motorized/mechanized events/tours allowed on designated routes, except in WSAs. Commercial use permits authorized in conjunction with organized events or when the use supports resource protection and management. Arch Canyon closed to OHV use. No commercial motorized or mechanized use in Arch Canyon. No commercial motorized or mechanized events or tours in 	<u>Commercial</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commercial motorized/mechanized events/tours allowed on designated routes, except in WSAs. Commercial use permits authorized in conjunction with organized events or when the use supports resource protection and management. *In Arch Canyon, OHV use would be limited to the designated route up to the National Forest boundary, a total of 8 miles one way. Organized and commercial groups would be required to obtain a Special Recreation Use Permit. This permit would allow access on the designated route up to the National Forest boundary, except from March 1 through August 31. During this period, access would be limited to 7.5 miles of the designated route. Therefore, during this period motorized access would not be allowed within .5 miles of the National Forest boundary.⁴ No commercial motorized or mechanized events or tours in crucial bighorn sheep lambing and rutting areas from April 1 to June 15 (lambing) and from October 15–December 15 (rutting), unless it can be shown that the animals are not

⁴ This is an implementation-level decision that cannot be protested under the planning regulations. Please see the cover letter for further information.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

	<p>(rutting), unless it can be shown that the animals are not present in a specific project location or the activity can be conducted so the animals are not adversely impacted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No commercial motorized or mechanized events or tours in crucial antelope habitat restrictions April 15–June 30.• No commercial motorized or mechanized events or tours in crucial deer and elk winter range November 1–May 15.• Group size for commercial motorized events/tours limited to 2 groups of 12 vehicles per route per day.• Special OHV events limited to 350 total vehicles and approved OHV event routes.• Balloon Festival limited to 35 balloons with their associated support vehicles.• Commercial hiking tours in Comb Wash and Butler Wash limited to 10 individuals. A permit system would be established for commercial day and overnight use.• Commercial camping limited to designated areas.• Commercial hiking to cultural sites limited to designated trails and human waste must be packed out.• Ropes and other climbing aides not allowed to access cultural sites.• Commercial guides using dogs to hunt/pursue mountain lion and black bears would not operate in areas where dogs are prohibited (Map 72).• No commercial motorized or mechanized use in Cedar Mesa ACEC.	<p>the activity can be conducted so the animals are not adversely impacted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No commercial motorized or mechanized events or tours allowed in crucial antelope habitat restrictions May 1–June 15.• No commercial motorized or mechanized events or tours allowed in crucial deer and elk winter range November 15–April 15.• Special OHV events limited to 350 total vehicles and approved OHV event routes.	<p>in a specific project location or the activity can be conducted so the animals are not adversely impacted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No commercial motorized or mechanized events or tours allowed in crucial antelope habitat restrictions May 15–June 15.• No commercial motorized or mechanized events or tours allowed in crucial deer and elk winter range December 15–March 31.• Group size for commercial motorized events/tours limited to 2 groups of 25 vehicles per route per day.• Special OHV events limited to 350 total vehicles and approved OHV event routes.• Balloon Festival limited to 35 balloons with their associated support vehicles.	<p>crucial bighorn sheep lambing and rutting areas from April 1 to July 15 (lambing) and from October 15–December 31 (rutting), unless it can be shown that the animals are not present in a specific project location or the activity can be conducted so the animals are not adversely impacted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No commercial motorized or mechanized events or tours in crucial antelope habitat restrictions April 15–June 30.• No commercial motorized or mechanized events or tours in crucial deer and elk winter range November 1–May 15.• Group size for commercial motorized events/tours limited to 2 groups of 12 vehicles per route per day.• Special OHV events limited to 350 total vehicles and approved OHV event routes.• Balloon Festival limited to 35 balloons with their associated support vehicles.• Commercial hiking tours in Comb Wash and Butler Wash limited to 10 individuals. A permit system would be established for commercial day and overnight use.• Commercial camping limited to designated areas.• Commercial hiking to cultural sites limited to designated trails, and human waste must be packed out.• Ropes and other climbing aides not allowed to access cultural sites.• Commercial guides using dogs to hunt/pursue mountain lion and black bears would not operate in areas where dogs are prohibited.• No commercial motorized or mechanized use in Cedar Mesa ACEC.	<p>present in a specific project location or the activity can be conducted so the animals are not adversely impacted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No commercial motorized or mechanized events or tours allowed in crucial antelope habitat restrictions May 1–June 15.• No commercial motorized or mechanized events or tours allowed in crucial deer and elk winter range November 15–April 15.• Special OHV events limited to 350 total vehicles and approved OHV event routes.• Group size for commercial motorized events/tours limited to 2 groups of 12 vehicles per route per day.• Balloon Festival limited to 35 balloons with their associated support vehicles.• Commercial hiking tours in Comb Wash and Butler Wash limited to 12 and 8 individuals (respectively). A permit system would be established for commercial day and overnight use.• Commercial camping limited to designated areas.• Commercial hiking to cultural sites limited to designated trails and human waste must be packed out.• Ropes and other climbing aides not allowed to access cultural sites.• Commercial guides using dogs to hunt/pursue mountain lion and black bears (Map 72) would not operate in areas where dogs are prohibited.• No commercial motorized or mechanized cross country use in Cedar Mesa SRMA.
Competitive Events					
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
Motorized/mechanized competitive events would be authorized consistent with OHV designations.					

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

Motorized and mechanized competitive events would not be permitted in WSAs.					
RIPARIAN RESOURCES					
<p>GOALS AND OBJECTIVES</p> <p>Manage riparian resources for desired future conditions, ensuring ecological diversity, stability, and sustainability, including the desired mix of vegetation types, structural stages, and landscape/riparian/watershed function and provide for native and special status plant, fish, and wildlife habitats.</p> <p>Manage riparian areas for properly functioning condition (PFC) and ensure stream channel morphology and functions are appropriate to the local soil type, climate, and landform.</p> <p>Avoid or minimize the destruction, loss or degradation of riparian, wetland and associated floodplains, and preserve and enhance natural and beneficial values.</p> <p>Public lands would be managed in accordance with laws, executive orders, and regulations on floodplain and wetland areas to reduce resource loss from floods and erosion.</p> <p>The BLM would take appropriate actions to maintain water quality in streams within Monticello PA to meet state and federal water quality standards, including designated beneficial uses and anti-degradation requirements.</p>					
<p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ALTERNATIVES</p> <p>Oil and gas leasing would be NSO in riparian areas.</p> <p>The BLM would follow Utah's Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing and Recreation Management (BLM 1997) to achieve riparian PFC.</p> <p>No new surface-disturbing activities would be allowed within active floodplains or within 100 meters of riparian areas unless it can be shown that: a) there are no practical alternatives or, b) all long-term impacts can be fully mitigated or, c) the activity will benefit and enhance the riparian area.</p> <p>BLM guidelines would be followed as appropriate for managing riparian areas (See Technical Reference 1737-6: Riparian Area Management as amended) and Utah Riparian Management Policy.</p> <p>All floodplains and riparian/aquatic areas would be managed in accordance with Executive Orders 11988 and 11990, Sections 303 and 404 of the Clean Water Act, the Endangered Species Act, the BLM Riparian Area Management Policy, and the Utah guidelines for implementing BLM riparian area management policy.</p> <p>Floodplains and riparian/aquatic areas would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Subject to fire suppression to protect riparian habitat.• Excluded from private and/or commercial use of woodland products, except for Native American traditional purposes as determined on site-specific basis; limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires would be allowed as per Woodlands section.• Available for habitat, range, and watershed improvements and vegetation treatments described in 1991 Vegetation EIS (as amended).• Excluded from surface disturbance by mechanized or motorized equipment (except as allowed above) and from structural development (unless there is no practical alternative or the development would enhance riparian/aquatic values). <p>Unnecessary multiple social foot trails in riparian/floodplain areas would be minimized. Social foot trails in Road Canyon, Fish Creek, and Mule Canyon would be closed to protect riparian resources.</p> <p>The BLM would follow/implement the Southwest Willow Flycatcher Recovery Plan as appropriate.</p> <p>Monitoring and management strategies and restrictions would be developed as necessary to meet or maintain PFC.</p> <p>Cottonwood and willow harvest would be allowed for Native American ceremonial uses only, through a permit system. Restrictions on this harvest would be implemented as necessary to achieve or maintain PFC.</p> <p>No camping would be allowed within 200 feet of isolated springs or water sources.</p> <p>Pipeline Crossings</p> <p>Pipeline crossings of perennial, intermittent, and ephemeral stream channels should be constructed to withstand 100-year floods to prevent breakage and subsequent accidental contamination of runoff during high-flow events. Surface crossings must be constructed high enough to remain above stream flows at each crossing, and subsurface crossings must be buried deep enough to remain undisturbed by scour throughout passage of the peak flow. Hydraulic analysis would be completed in the design phase by the project proponent to eliminate potential environmental degradation associated with pipeline breaks at stream crossings to avoid repeated maintenance of such crossings. Specific recommendations regarding surface and subsurface crossings are found in Guidance for Pipeline Crossings (see Appendix F).</p>					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
BLM would act to avoid degradation of stream banks or aquatic habitats and loss of riparian vegetation. Special conditions found in the 1991 San Juan RMP (BLM 1991a, page 98) for floodplains and riparian/aquatic areas would be implemented.	Close Harts Canyon from private land to Yancy's Fence to OHV and mechanized use. Close routes in other selected riparian areas considered Functioning at Risk if site-specific analysis determines that OHV use is contributing to riparian degradation. Restrict Harts Canyon, Shay Canyon ACEC, and Indian Creek from Kelly Ranch vicinity to Forest Service to livestock trailing only, not	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B, except non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, as unavailable for OHV use, as ROW exclusion areas, as unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, as unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, as VRM Class I, and as proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.	Note: Close Harts Canyon from private land (Seeps) to Yancy's Fence (T30S, R22E, Section 8) to OHV and mechanized use ⁵ . Close routes in other selected riparian areas considered Functioning at Risk if site-specific analysis determines that OHV use is contributing to riparian degradation. Restrict Harts Canyon, Shay Canyon ACEC and Indian Creek from Kelly Ranch vicinity to Forest Service to livestock trailing only, not grazing. Moki Canyon and Lake Canyon would be restricted to trailing only, except in the spring and fall for up to 1 to 2 weeks to gather livestock prior to moving to and from these areas. Develop seasonal restrictions, closures, and/or forage utilization

⁵ This is an implementation-level decision that cannot be protested under the planning regulations. Please see the cover letter for further information.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

	grazing. Moki Canyon and Lake Canyon would be restricted to trailing only, except in the spring and fall for up to 1 to 2 weeks to gather livestock prior to moving to and from these areas. Develop seasonal restrictions, closures, and/or forage utilization limits on grazing in riparian areas considered Functioning at Risk. Temporarily close riparian areas considered Functioning at Risk to dispersed motorized camping until PFC is restored.				limits on grazing in riparian areas considered Functioning at Risk. Temporarily close riparian areas considered Functioning at Risk to dispersed motorized camping until PFC is restored.
SOIL AND WATER RESOURCES					
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES					
Manage soils and water resources to maintain watershed health, thereby insuring ecological diversity and sustainability. Provide for favorable conditions of water flow (quality, quantity, and timing), and maintain stable and efficient stream channels as required and provide for fish and wildlife habitat, recreation, and livestock.					
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ALTERNATIVES					
Manage all floodplains and riparian/wetlands in accordance with Executive Orders 11988 and 11990, Sections 303 and 404 of the Clean Water Act, and the Endangered Species Act. Maintain satisfactory watershed conditions as indicated by maintenance of riparian PFC and Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management (BLM 1991a) and Guidelines for Grazing and Standards for Public Health and Guidelines for Recreation Management for BLM Lands in Utah (Appendix E). Manage public lands consistent with the Colorado River Salinity Control Act. Comply with Utah's state water quality standards. Collaborate with San Juan County, the State of Utah, tribal governments, and local municipalities on management of municipal watersheds to meet local needs. Maintain or improve soil quality and long-term soil productivity through the implementation of Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management (BLM 1997) and other soil protection measures. Manage uses to minimize and mitigate damage to soils. Maintain and/or restore overall watershed health and reduce erosion, stream sedimentation, and salinization of water.					
<u>Watershed Health</u> Modify the BMPs and vegetation management as appropriate to meet water quality standards and maintain watershed function (Montezuma Creek, Indian Creek [the USFS boundary to Newspaper Rock], Johnson Creek [and tributaries from confluence with Recapture Creek to headwaters], and Recapture Reservoir). Assess watershed function using Utah's Standards for Rangeland Health, riparian PFC, and state water quality standards. Where Utah's Standards for Rangeland Health are not met due to the impairment of biological soil crusts, apply guidelines from Biological Soil Crusts: Ecology and Management (BLM 2001b, as revised), if consistent with the management decisions of this plan. Reduce tamarisk where appropriate using allowable vegetation treatments (refer to vegetation section for treatment acreages).					
<u>Sensitive Soils</u> Any proposed activities that would be located in sensitive soils (e.g., hydric, saline, gypsiferous, or highly erodible soils, (Maps 41–47) would incorporate BMPs and other mitigation measures to minimize soil erosion and maintain soil stability. Site-specific mitigation measures and other additional mitigation measures required to protect soil resources and maintain soil productivity, would be determined in site-specific NEPA analysis.					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Protect and manage soil resources to maintain or increase soil productivity as needed.	If surface-disturbing activities cannot be avoided on slopes between 21% and 40%, an erosion control plan would be required. The plan must be approved by the BLM prior to construction and maintenance and include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">An erosion control strategyThe BLM accepted and/or approved survey and design	If surface-disturbing activities cannot be avoided on slopes between 21% and 40%, an erosion control plan would be required. The plan must be approved by the BLM prior to construction and maintenance and include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">An erosion control strategyThe BLM accepted and/or approved survey and design For slopes greater than 40%, no surface disturbance would be allowed unless it is determined that it	If surface-disturbing activities cannot be avoided on slopes greater than 40%, a plan would be required. The plan must be approved by the BLM prior to construction and maintenance, and include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">An erosion control strategyThe BLM accepted and/or approved survey and design	Same as Alternative B.	If surface-disturbing activities cannot be avoided on slopes between 21% and 40%, an erosion control plan would be required. The plan must be approved by the BLM prior to construction and maintenance and include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">An erosion control strategyThe BLM accepted and/or approved survey and design For slopes greater than 40%, no surface disturbance would be allowed unless it is determined that it would cause undue or unnecessary degradation to pursue other placement alternatives. An erosion control plan would be required.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

		would cause undue or unnecessary degradation to pursue other placement alternatives. An erosion control plan would be required.			
SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS—AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN					
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR ALL ACECS					
Designate, modify, and manage areas as ACECs where special management attention is required to protect and prevent irreparable damage to important historic, cultural, or scenic values, fish and wildlife resources, other natural systems or processes, or to protect life and safety from natural hazards.					
ALKALI RIDGE ACEC—Relevance and Importance Value: Cultural Resources					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Alkali Ridge ACEC (39,202 acres) (Map 50) : Would be designated as a Cultural ACEC. It contains a National Historic Landmark (2,340 acres) and would be managed with the following management prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Where riparian areas overlap this ACEC, the special conditions for floodplain and riparian/aquatic areas would take precedence.Requirements of appropriate regulations would be met.All cultural properties eligible for the NRHP, would be surrounded by an avoidance area sufficient to allow permanent protection.If cultural resources or their avoidance areas cannot be avoided, appropriate mitigation would be applied, ranging from limited testing to extensive excavation.In any given situation, mitigation would be designed to fit the specific circumstances and reviewed by the SHPO and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.Available for mineral leasing (Category 1).Available for geophysical work.Available for the disposal of mineral materials.Available for locatable mineral entry with an approved plan of operations.Retained in public ownership and not classified, segregated, or withdrawn from entry.Available for private and commercial use of woodland	Alkali Ridge would be designated as an ACEC (39,196 acres) (Map 51) and would be managed the same as Alternative A, except for the following changes in management prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products, except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.Watershed improvements allowed.Livestock use may be restricted if cultural resources are being impacted.No surface-disturbing vegetation treatments. Any treatment must avoid cultural sites by sufficient margin as to have no impact.Managed as VRM Class IV.	Alkali Ridge would be designated as ACEC (39,196 acres) (Map 52) and would be the same as Alternative A, except for the following changes in management prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Available for woodland harvest, limited to designated routes. Off-road travel would only be allowed in chained areas. If woodland product use is impacting cultural resources, woodland product use may be confined to specific areas within Alkali Ridge.Available for watershed improvements.Livestock may be restricted if cultural resources are being impacted.Vegetation treatments would avoid cultural sites wherever possible to prevent impacts. Access routes used for vegetation treatments would be reclaimed to prevent future use. Non–surface-disturbing treatments would be preferred.Managed as VRM Class IV.	Alkali Ridge would not be designated as an ACEC. The area would be managed with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Available for woodland harvest, limited to designated routes.Available for watershed improvements.Livestock use would conform to Rangeland Health Standards.Vegetative treatments would avoid eligible cultural sites and NHL.Managed as VRM Class IV.Available for mineral leasing under standard stipulationsAvailable for geophysical work.Available for the disposal of mineral materials.Available for locatable mineral entry with an approved plan of operations.Retained in public ownership and not classified, segregated or withdrawn from entry.Subject to conditional fire suppression.OHV use limited to designated roads and trails.Campfires allowed.Available for wildlife habitat improvement.Surface disturbance limited to what can be successfully established within 5 years after project completion.	Same as Alternative B.	Alkali Ridge would be designated as ACEC (39,196 acres) (Map 53) and would be managed with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Where the BLM authorized officer determines that avoidance of direct and indirect impacts to historic properties is not feasible (e.g., avoidance may cause unacceptable damage to other public land resources or affect valid existing rights) and adverse effects may occur, the BLM would resolve those effects through development of appropriate mitigation measures and consultation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act as outlined in the regulations as 36 CFR 800.Additional measures such as fencing, camouflaging, sound muffling, etc. may be necessary to further avoid indirect and direct impacts caused by surface-disturbing activities.Management will emphasize maintaining the relevant and important cultural and historic values within the ACEC. When siting facilities, the primary objective will be avoidance of direct and indirect impacts to resources on, or eligible for listing on, the NRHP (historic properties). Avoidance may require that a facility be moved farther than allowed under standard lease terms and conditions. Siting may require coordination among the BLM, State Historic Preservation Officer, and Utah Division of Oil Gas and Mining to ensure consistency with all applicable well spacing requirements.All cultural properties eligible for the NRHP, would be surrounded by an avoidance area sufficient to allow permanent protection.In any given situation, mitigation would be designed to fit the specific circumstances and reviewed by the SHPO and if necessary, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.Available for geophysical exploration.Available for the disposal of mineral materials.Available for locatable mineral entry with an approved plan of operations.Retained in public ownership and not classified, segregated, or withdrawn from entry.Campfires allowed.Available for wildlife habitat improvement.A Cultural CRMP consistent with the goals and objectives of this RMP would be written for Alkali Ridge ACEC and would not require a plan amendment to RMP.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

<p>products.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Available for livestock use.• Available for land treatments or other range improvements.• Subject to conditional fire suppression.• OHV use limited to existing roads and trails.• Managed as VRM Class III.• Campfires allowed.• Available for wildlife habitat improvement.• Surface disturbance limited to what can be successfully established within 5 years after project completion.					<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Available for watershed improvements.• Available for private and/or commercial use of woodland harvest, of which access would be limited only to designated routes. If woodland product use is impacting cultural resources, woodland product use may be confined to specific areas within Alkali Ridge.• Livestock may be restricted if cultural resources are being impacted.• Managed as VRM Class III.• Available for mineral leasing under controlled surface use.• Available for vegetation treatments. Access routes used for vegetation treatments would be reclaimed to prevent future use. Non–surface-disturbing treatments would be preferred.• Appropriate management for wildland fire in accordance with the Moab District Fire Plan.• OHV use limited to designated roads and trails.
<p>In the Alkali Ridge National Historic Landmark (Contained within the Alkali Ridge ACEC) (2,340 acres) management would be the same as the Alkali Ridge ACEC above,, except that all cultural resources would be avoided by 100 feet.</p>	<p>In the Alkali Ridge National Historic Landmark (Contained within the Alkali Ridge ACEC) (2,146 acres), management would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO.• All mechanized/motorized traffic limited to designated routes.• Campfires not allowed.• Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.• Available for watershed improvements.• Open to livestock use with restrictions if cultural resources become impacted.• No surface-disturbing vegetation treatments. Any treatment must avoid cultural sites by sufficient margin as to have no adverse impact.• Unavailable for geophysical work.• Unavailable for disposal of mineral materials.• Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.• Surface disturbance allowed for emergency fire suppression.• Recreation use limited if cultural resources become impacted.• Climbing aids such as ropes not allowed for access into cultural	<p>In the Alkali Ridge National Historic Landmark (Contained within the Alkali Ridge ACEC) (2,146 acres), management would be the same as for Alternative B, except for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Appropriate Management Response to fire.• Available for geophysical exploration that meets the definition of "casual use" as defined 43 CFR 3150.	<p>In the Alkali Ridge National Historic Landmark (Contained within the Alkali Ridge ACEC) (2,146 acres),, management would be the same as Alternative C.</p>	<p>In the Alkali Ridge National Historic Landmark (Contained within the Alkali Ridge ACEC) (2,146 acres),, management would be the same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>In the Alkali Ridge National Historic Landmark (Contained within the Alkali Ridge ACEC) (2,146 acres), management would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO.• All mechanized/motorized traffic limited to designated routes.• Campfires not allowed.• Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.• Available for watershed improvements.• Appropriate Management Response to fire in accordance with the Moab District Fire Plan.• Open to livestock use with restrictions if cultural resources become impacted.• No surface-disturbing vegetation treatments. Any treatment must avoid cultural sites by sufficient margin as to have no adverse impact.• Available for geophysical exploration that meets the definition of "casual use" as defined 43 CFR 3150.b) <i>Casual use</i> means activities that involve practices which do not ordinarily lead to any appreciable disturbance or damage to lands, resources and improvements. For example, activities which do not involve use of heavy equipment or explosives and which do not involve vehicular movement, except over established roads and trails are casual use.• Unavailable for disposal of mineral materials.• Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.• Surface disturbance allowed for emergency fire suppression.• Recreation use limited if cultural resources become impacted.• Climbing aids such as ropes not allowed for access into cultural sites/ruins.• ROW avoidance area.• Managed as VRM Class III.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

	sites/ruins.				
BRIDGER JACK MESA (Mesa Top Only) ACEC—Relevance and Importance Value: Near Relict Vegetation					
Bridger Jack Mesa ACEC lies entirely within a WSA and will be managed under the IMP, unless more restrictive management is prescribed. Management under the IMP will provide for the protection for near-relict vegetation.					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
<p>Bridger Jack Mesa ACEC (6,260 acres) (Map 50), is designated as an ACEC for Range Management Program/Near-relict Vegetation, and would be managed with the following management prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Unavailable for mineral leasing• Available for geophysical exploration.• Unavailable for the disposal of mineral materials.• Available for locatable mineral entry with approved plan of operations, subject to stipulations precluding surface use of the mesa top, insofar as possible.• Retained in public ownership and not classified, segregated, or withdrawn from entry.• Excluded from livestock grazing, including grazing by saddle stock and pack animals allowed for access.• Excluded from land treatments or other improvements, except for test plots and facilities necessary for study of the near-relict plant communities.• Closed to OHV use.• Subject to conditional fire suppression.• Managed to limit recreation use if vegetation resources are being damaged.• Semiprimitive nonmotorized (SPNM) ROS class.• Excluded from private or commercial use of woodland products, except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.• Excluded from wildlife habitat improvements.• Excluded from watershed control structures.• Surface disturbance limited to what can be successfully	<p>Bridger Jack Mesa would be designated as ACEC (6,225 acres). (Map 51), The prescriptions are the same as Alternative A, except for the 35 acre boundary change.</p>	<p>Bridger Jack Mesa would not be managed as an ACEC. Bridger Jack Mesa WSA would be managed according to the IMP, except for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Unavailable for livestock grazing, including grazing by saddle stock and pack animals allowed for access.• Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products, except for the limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.	<p>Bridger Jack Mesa would not be designated as an ACEC. The prescriptions are the same as Alternative C.</p>	<p>Bridger Jack Mesa would be designated as ACEC (6,225 acres) (Map 51). The prescriptions are the same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>Bridger Jack Mesa would not be managed as an ACEC. Bridger Jack Mesa WSA would be managed according to the IMP, except for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Unavailable for livestock grazing, including grazing by saddle stock and pack animals allowed for access.• Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products, including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.• Campfires would be restricted to fire rings, where available. If not available, subject to “Leave No Trace” principles.• Bridger Jack Mesa area would be managed as part of the Indian Creek Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA) described in the Recreation section of this Chapter.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

established within 5 years after project completion. <ul style="list-style-type: none">Excluded from surface disturbance by mechanized or motorized equipment, except helicopter access for scientific study and heliportable equipment, insofar as legally possible.Excluded from improvements for wildlife habitat, watershed, or vegetative treatments.					
BUTLER WASH NORTH ACEC—Relevance and Importance Value: Scenic					
Butler Wash North ACEC lies within the Butler Wash WSA and will be managed under the IMP, unless more restrictive management is prescribed. Management under the IMP will provide for the protection of scenic values.					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Butler Wash ACEC (17,464 acres) (Map 50) is designated as an ACEC for scenic values and is managed with the following management prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Managed under the special conditions developed for ROS-P class areas.Closed to mineral leasing.Closed to mineral leasingAvailable for geophysical work.Unavailable for disposal of mineral materials.Available for mineral entry with an approved plan of operations.Retained in public ownership and not classified, segregated, or withdrawn from entry.Excluded from private and commercial use of woodland products, except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.Available for livestock use.Closed to OHV use.Managed to limit recreation use if scenic values are being damaged.Managed as VRM Class I.	The Butler Wash North ACEC (17,365 acres) (Map 51) would be designated as a ACEC and would be managed with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Managed as VRM Class I.Closed to mineral leasing.Closed to mineral leasing.Unavailable for disposal of mineral materials.Retained in public ownership and withdrawn from entry.Closed to private and/or commercial use of woodland products, except for limited on-site collection of dead wood.Available for livestock use but may be limited if cultural resources are being impacted.Managed to limit recreation use if scenic values are being damaged.The BLM would seek to acquire state in-holdings in this ACEC.Closed to OHV use.	The Butler Wash North area would not be designated as an ACEC, but would be managed under the IMP. Additional management prescriptions include: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Retained in public ownership.Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products, with the exception of the limited on-site collection of wood for campfires.Available for livestock use but may be limited if cultural resources are impacted.Closed to OHV use.Managed as VRM Class I	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Same as Alternative C, except for OHV use is limited to designated roads and trails (ways).	Same as Alternative B.	Butler Wash North area would not be designated as an ACEC but would be managed under the IMP. Management prescriptions include: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Retained in public ownership.Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products, with the exception of the limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.Available for livestock use but may be limited if cultural resources are impacted.Closed to OHV use.Managed as VRM Class I.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

CEDAR MESA ACEC—Relevance and Importance Values: Fish and Wildlife, Cultural and Scenic					
Note: In the 1991 San Juan RMP, the Cedar Mesa ACEC was described as protecting values for Recreation/Visual (VRM) because these two programs were combined and managed under the Recreation program. Since that time, the two programs have been separated and are now managed under their own resource management program. Scenic is considered a relevant value under ACEC evaluation processes, however, Recreation is not. Therefore, any existing ACECs that are brought forward in this plan will not include Recreation as a value. Management for recreational values would be managed as an SRMA under the Recreation program.					
Portions of the Cedar Mesa ACEC lie within 4 WSAs (Maps 87–90): Mule Canyon, Grand Gulch ISA Complex Fish Creek Canyon, and Road Canyon. Where the ACEC overlies these WSAs, the ACEC would be managed under the IMP, unless more restrictive management is prescribed.					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
<p>Cedar Mesa ACEC (295,336 acres) (Map 50) is designated as an ACEC for cultural and scenic values. Recreation/Primitive Area/Natural Area values would be maintained and would continue to be managed under the existing Grand Gulch Plateau Cultural and Recreation Management Plan and Recreation/Scenic programs with the following management prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Where riparian areas overlap Cedar Mesa ACEC, the special conditions for floodplains and riparian/aquatic areas would take precedence.The ROS special conditions include both P and SPNM classes apply, and would be managed for these classes. ROS P-class areas would be managed as NSO.If cultural resources or their avoidance areas cannot be avoided, appropriate mitigation would be applied, ranging from limited testing to extensive excavation.In any given case, mitigation would be designed to fit the specific circumstances and reviewed by the SHPO and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. The Cedar Mesa Management Plan developed for the ACEC would guide site protection, data recovery, and all other necessary cultural management activities.Revegetation for surface disturbance would be limited to what can be successfully established within 5 years after project completion.Available for mineral leasing (Category 1), except within WSAs where it is closed.	<p>Cedar Mesa ACEC (306,742 acres) (Map 51) would continue to be managed as a ACEC (same as Alternative A) with the following additional prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Available for livestock use with special conditions to protect at-risk cultural resources.Available for watershed, range, habitat improvements and vegetation treatments.Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products, except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.Campfires limited to mesa tops, would be closed if there are impacts to cultural sites.Closed to dispersed camping.Designated parking areas adjacent to designated routes.Limited number of recreation permits issued for day hikes and overnight camping as necessary to prevent cultural site damage from over-visitation.Overnight campers must pack out their human waste.Managed as VRM Class III (except for WSAs within the boundary of the ACEC which would be managed as VRM Class I). <p><u>Grand Gulch Special Emphasis Area</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Same as Alternative A.Intersection of Cedar Mesa ACEC and the Scenic Highway Corridor ACEC <p>The Scenic Highway Corridor ACEC would not be designated under this alternative. Management would be in accordance with the Cedar Mesa ACEC.</p>	<p>Cedar Mesa area would not be designated as an ACEC. It would be managed as a Cultural Special Recreation Management (CSRMA) area (375,734 acres) described under the Recreation section in this Chapter. In addition, there would be two Cultural Special Management Areas (CSMAs) (McLoyd Canyon–Moon House and Grand Gulch NHD) with restrictive management for the protection of cultural resources, described under the Cultural Resource section of this Chapter. The WSAs (209,619 acres) would be managed according to the IMP.</p>	<p>Cedar Mesa area would not be designated as an ACEC, same as Alternative C.</p>	<p>Cedar Mesa area would be designated as an ACEC, It would be managed the same as Alternative B, except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Map 33), which would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, closed to OHV use, ROW exclusion areas, closed to disposal of mineral materials, unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, VRM Class I, and proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.</p>	<p>Cedar Mesa area would not be designated as an ACEC. The area would be managed as a Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA) (407,098 acres) described in the Recreation section of this Chapter. It would include three Recreation Management Zones (RMZs) (Grand Gulch NHD, McLoyd Canyon- Moon House and Comb Ridge) that emphasize management of recreation users for the protection of cultural resources.</p>

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

<div><ul style="list-style-type: none">• Surface use limited by special conditions.• Available for geophysical exploration.• Available for disposal of mineral materials, except within WSAs where it is closed.• Available for mineral entry with an approved plan of operations.• Available for livestock use.• Available for land treatments or other range improvements.• Available for wildlife habitat improvements.• Subject to conditional fire suppression with motorized suppression methods used only if necessary to protect life or property.• Excluded from surface disturbance by mechanized or motorized equipment.• OHV use limited to designated roads/trails.• Available for private and commercial use of woodland products in designated areas with designated access, except that on-site collection of dead fuelwood for campfires would be allowed throughout the area.<p><u>Grand Gulch Special Emphasis Area</u></p><p>Contained within the Cedar Mesa ACEC; would be managed as:</p><ul style="list-style-type: none">• Closed to mineral leasing (Category 4).• Not available for geophysical exploration.• Unavailable for disposal of mineral materials.• Retained in public ownership and classified as segregated from entry (a Secretarial withdrawal would be requested).• Excluded from private and commercial use of woodland products, except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.• Available for livestock use, except Grand Gulch itself, below Kane Gulch fence to the</div>					
--	--	--	--	--	--

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

confluence with the San Juan River, 11,200 acres. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Designated as closed to OHV use.• Managed to limit recreation use if cultural resources or scenic values are being damaged.• Managed as VRM Class I.• Intersection of Cedar Mesa ACEC and the Scenic Highway Corridor ACEC. Where these two ACECs intersect along U-95 and U-261, that portion would be managed as: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Available for mineral leasing subject to NSO.• Managed as VRM Class I.					
<p>DARK CANYON ACEC—Relevance and Importance Values: Scenic and Fish and Wildlife</p> <p>Note: In the 1991 San Juan RMP, the Dark Canyon ACEC was described as protecting values for Recreation/Visual (VRM) because these two programs were combined and managed under the Recreation program. Since that time, the two programs have been separated and are now managed under their own resource management program. Scenic is considered a relevant value under ACEC evaluation processes, however, Recreation is not. Therefore any existing ACECs that are brought forward in this plan will not include Recreation as a value. Management for recreational values would be handled under the Recreation program, specifically SRMAs.</p> <p>Dark Canyon ACEC lies entirely within the Dark Canyon WSA (Maps 87–90) and partially within the Dark Canyon SRMA (Maps 36–40). WSAs are managed under the IMP, unless more restrictive management is prescribed.</p>					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Dark Canyon ACEC (61,660 acres) (Map 50) would continue to be designated as an ACEC for Recreation/Natural Area and Visual/VRM values, and would be maintained and managed with the following management prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Unavailable for mineral leasing.• Unavailable for geophysical work.• Unavailable for disposal of mineral materials.• Retained in public ownership• Recommended for mineral withdrawal• Excluded from private and commercial use of woodland products, except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.• Unavailable for livestock use except in Fable Valley, where livestock trailing and emergency grazing (drought or severe winter) would be allowed.• Closed to OHV use.• Managed as VRM Class I with projects that meet these visual	Dark Canyon (61,660 acres) (Map 51) would be designated as a ACEC, and would be managed with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Unavailable for oil and gas leasing.• Unavailable for geophysical exploration.• Unavailable for disposal of mineral materials.• Retained in public ownership and recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry.• Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products, except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires on mesa tops.• Campfires limited to mesa top with fire pan (no campfires in canyons).• Human waste to be packed out.• Unavailable for livestock use except in Fable Valley, where livestock trailing and emergency grazing (severe winter) would be allowed.• Closed to OHV use.	Dark Canyon would not be managed as an ACEC. Dark Canyon WSA would be managed according to the IMP with the following additional restrictions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Campfires limited to mesa top with fire pan (no campfires allowed in canyon).• Excluded from private and/or commercial use of woodland products, except for on site collection of dead wood for fires on mesa tops.• Unavailable for livestock grazing except in Fable Valley, where livestock trailing and emergency grazing (severe winter) would be allowed.• Closed to OHV/mechanized use.• Managed to limit recreation use if wildlife habitat or scenic values are being damaged.• Subject to appropriate fire management response with habitat-disturbing suppression methods used only if necessary to protect life or property.• The Dark Canyon Wild and Scenic suitable river segment	Dark Canyon would not be managed as an ACEC. Same as Alternative C.	Dark Canyon (61,660 acres) (Map 51) would be designated as a ACEC, Same as Alternative B.	Dark Canyon would not be managed as an ACEC. Dark Canyon WSA would be managed according to the IMP and the Dark Canyon SRMA management prescriptions outlined in the Recreation section of this chapter. The WSA and SRMA would be closed to OHV use.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

standards allowed. <ul style="list-style-type: none">Managed to limit recreation use if cultural resources or scenic values are being damaged.Subject to conditional fire suppression, with motorized suppression methods used only if necessary to protect life or property.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Managed as VRM Class I with projects that meet these visual standards allowed.Managed to limit recreation use if wildlife habitat or scenic values are being damaged.Subject to conditional fire suppression, with motorized suppression methods used only if necessary to protect life or property.Improvements conditionally allowed for wildlife habitat, watershed, and vegetative treatments that meet VRM Class I and IMP management.	would be recommended for mineral withdrawal.			
HOVENWEEP ACEC—Relevance and Importance Values: Scenic, Habitat, and Cultural					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
<p>Hovenweep ACEC (1,798 acres) (Map 50). would continue to be managed as an ACEC for Cultural and Habitat Management values with two special emphasis zones. The following management prescriptions would apply:</p> <p><u>General Area Exclusive of Special Emphasis Zones</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Where riparian areas overlap Hovenweep ACEC, the special conditions for floodplains and riparian/aquatic areas would take precedence.Within Hovenweep ACEC, cultural properties eligible for the NRHP would be avoided by 100 feet.Cultural properties eligible for the NRHP would be surrounded by an avoidance area sufficient to allow permanent protection.If cultural resources or their avoidance areas cannot be avoided, appropriate mitigation would be applied, ranging from limited testing to extensive excavation.In any given case, mitigation would be designed to fit the specific circumstances and reviewed by the SHPO and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. A Hovenweep National Monument Cooperative Management Strategy (1987)	<p>Hovenweep would be designated as an ACEC (2,439 acres) (Map 51). and would be managed the same as Alternative A with the addition of 641 acres contiguous with the existing ACEC and east of Hovenweep National Monument</p> <p>The ACEC, exclusive of special emphasis zones, would be managed the same as the general area with the following changes to stipulations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Cultural properties eligible for the NRHP would be avoided as necessary to provide permanent protection. This would be implemented on a case-by-case basis.No new routes designated in this ACEC.No surface-disturbing habitat, watershed, or vegetation treatments. Any treatment must avoid cultural sites by sufficient margin as to avoid adverse impact.Available for mineral leasing with standard stipulations.	<p>Hovenweep would be designated as an ACEC (2,439 acres) (Map 52). and would be managed the same as Alternative A with the addition of 641 acres contiguous with the existing ACEC and east of Hovenweep National Monument</p> <p>The ACEC, exclusive of special emphasis zones, would be managed the same as the general area with the following changes to stipulations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Available for watershed improvements and vegetative treatments as long as cultural sites are not impacted. Emphasis would be on non–surface-disturbing vegetation treatments.Available for mineral leasing with standard stipulations.	<p>Hovenweep would not be designated as an ACEC. Management prescriptions for this area would be the same as the surrounding lands and include but are not limited to the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Available for watershed improvements and vegetative treatments as long as cultural sites are not impacted. Emphasis would be on non–surface-disturbing vegetation treatments.Managed as VRM Class III and IV.Available for disposal of mineral materials.Available for mineral leasing with standard stipulations.	<p>Hovenweep would be designated as an ACEC (2,439 acres) (Map 51). and would be managed the same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>Hovenweep would be designated as an ACEC (2,439 acres) (Map 53). with two special emphasis zones.</p> <p>The following management prescriptions would apply:</p> <p><u>General Area Exclusive of Special Emphasis Zones</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Management will emphasize maintaining the relevant and important cultural and historic values. When siting facilities, the primary objective will be avoidance of direct and indirect impacts to resources on or eligible for listing on the NRHP (historic properties). Avoidance may require that a facility be moved farther than allowed under standard lease terms and conditions. Siting may require coordination among BLM, State Historic Preservation Officer, and Utah Division of Oil Gas and Mining to ensure consistency with all applicable well spacing requirements.Where the BLM authorized officer determines that avoidance of direct and indirect impacts to historic properties is not feasible (e.g., avoidance may cause unacceptable damage to other public land resources or affect valid existing rights) and adverse effects may occur, the BLM would resolve those effects through development of appropriate mitigation measures and consultation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act as outlined in the regulations as 36 CFR 800.Additional measures such as fencing, camouflaging, sound muffling, etc. may be necessary to further avoid indirect and direct impacts caused by surface-disturbing activities.Within Hovenweep ACEC, cultural properties eligible for the NRHP would be avoided by 100 feet.Cultural properties eligible for the NRHP would be surrounded by an avoidance area sufficient to allow permanent protection.In any given case, mitigation would be designed to fit the specific circumstances and reviewed by the SHPO, and if necessary, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. A Hovenweep National Monument Cooperative Management Strategy (1987) helps to guide site protection, data recovery,

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

<p>helps to guide site protection, data recovery, and all other necessary cultural management activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Available for mineral leasing (Category 2).• Available for geophysical exploration.• Unavailable for disposal of mineral materials.• Available for mineral entry with an approved plan of operation.• Available for livestock use.• Subject to conditional fire suppression.• OHV use limited to designated roads/trails.• Excluded from private or commercial use of woodland products, except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.• Open for improvement in habitat, watershed and vegetation treatments.• Managed as VRM Class III. <p><u>Visual Emphasis Zone (880 acres)</u></p> <p>Surrounds the west, south and east sides of Hovenweep National Monument and would be managed in accordance with the general prescriptions and with the following special prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• NSO for mineral leasing.• Excluded from watershed and grazing (vegetative) treatment improvement.• Managed as VRM Class III. <p><u>Cajon Pond Emphasis Zone (Habitat)</u></p> <p>Approximately 1 acre fenced exclusion area in the northern part of the ACEC. It would be managed in accordance with the general prescriptions and with the following special prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mineral leasing would be in accordance with a controlled timing stipulation during the shorebird and waterfowl courtship and nesting season of March 1–June 30.• Excluded from livestock use.					<p>and all other necessary cultural management activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A Cultural CRMP consistent with the goals and objectives of this RMP would be written for Hovenweep ACEC, if necessary, and would not require a plan amendment to RMP• Available for mineral leasing subject to minor constraints (CSU).• Available for geophysical exploration.• Unavailable for disposal of mineral materials.• Appropriate management for wildland fire in accordance with the Moab District Fire Plan.• Available for mineral entry with an approved plan of operation.• OHV use limited to designated roads/trails.• Excluded from private or commercial use of woodland products, except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.• Improvements for habitat, watershed and vegetation treatments could be considered.• Livestock use may be restricted if cultural resources are impacted.• Managed as VRM Class III. <p><u>Visual Emphasis Zone (880 acres)</u></p> <p>Surrounds the west, south, and east sides of Hovenweep National Monument and would be managed in accordance with the general prescriptions and with the following special prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• NSO for mineral leasing.• Excluded from watershed and grazing (vegetative) treatment improvement.• ROW avoidance area.• Managed as VRM Class II.• Livestock use may be restricted if cultural resources are impacted. <p><u>Cajon Pond Emphasis Zone (Habitat)</u></p> <p>Approximately 1 acre fenced exclusion area in the northern part of the ACEC. It would be managed in accordance with the general prescriptions and with the following special prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mineral leasing would also be in accordance with a controlled timing stipulation during the shorebird and waterfowl courtship and nesting season of March 1–June 30.• Excluded from livestock use.
---	--	--	--	--	---

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

INDIAN CREEK ACEC—Relevance and Importance Value: Scenic					
Note: In the 1991 San Juan RMP, Indian Creek ACEC was described as protecting values for Recreation/Visual (VRM) because these two programs were combined and managed under the Recreation program. Since that time, the two programs have been separated and are now managed under their own resource management programs. Scenic is considered a relevant value under ACEC evaluation processes, however, recreation is not. Therefore any existing ACECs that are brought forward in this plan will not include recreation as a value. Management for recreational values would be handled under the recreation program, specifically SRMAs.					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
<p>Indian Creek ACEC (8,510 acres) (Map 50) covers an area adjacent to Canyonlands National Park, falls within Canyon Basins SRMA. Portions of the Indian Creek ACEC lie within portions of the Indian Creek WSA, which would be managed under the IMP. The ACEC would be managed to maintain scenic quality with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Almost all the ACEC would be in ROS P-class areas.• All vegetation must be with native species naturally occurring in the vicinity.• Available for mineral leasing with stipulations to prevent surface occupancy (Category 3) NSO; however, the are manager would grant an exception to the NSO stipulation in the event it is determined through and EA or EIS, is necessary, with the adoption and use of appropriate mitigation measures, that the project would meet visual quality standards for the area.• Available for geophysical exploration.• Unavailable for disposal of mineral materials.• Available for mineral entry with an approved plan of operations.• Retained in public ownership.• Excluded from private and commercial use of woodland products, except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.• Closed to OHV use.• Managed to limit recreation use if scenic values are being damaged.• Managed as VRM Class I.• Subject to conditional fire suppression, with motorized suppression methods used only	<p>Indian Creek (8,510 acres) (Map 51) would be designated as a ACEC. It would be managed the same as Alternative A with the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry.• Campfires are restricted to fire rings where fire rings are available.• Excluded from on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.	<p>Indian Creek (3,908 acres) (Map 52) would be designated as an ACEC. The WSA would be eliminated from within the boundary. Management would be the same as Alternative B, except OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails.</p>	<p>Indian Creek would not be designated as an ACEC. Management prescriptions for this area would be the same as the surrounding lands. Recreational restrictions are described under the Indian Creek SRMA in this Chapter. Other management in this area would include, but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• OHV use limited to designated roads and trails.• Mineral leasing subject to standard stipulations and minor constraints.• Open to mineral material sales.• Managed as VRM Class III.	<p>Indian Creek (8,510 acres) (Map 51) would be designated as a ACEC. Same as Alternative B, except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, as unavailable for OHV use, as ROW exclusion areas, as unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, as unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, as VRM Class I, and as proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.</p>	<p>Indian Creek (3,908 acres) (Map 53) would be designated as a ACEC and would be managed with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Managed as VRM Class I.• Available for mineral leasing subject to No Surface Occupancy (NSO).• Unavailable for disposal of mineral materials.• Available for geophysical work if VRM Class I can be met.• Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products, except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.• Available for livestock use.• Closed to OHV use.• All revegetation must be with native species naturally occurring in the vicinity.• Managed to limit recreation use if scenic values are being damaged.• Retained in public ownership and recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry.• ROW avoidance area.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

if necessary to protect life and property.					
LAVENDER MESA (Mesa Top Only) ACEC—Relevance and Importance Value: Relict Vegetation					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
<p>Lavender Mesa ACEC (Map 50). Grazing Management Program, Relict Vegetation, (649 acres): Would be maintained and would continue to be managed with the following management prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Managed to provide a baseline for rangeland studies through research and experiments and to allow for SPNM recreation.• Managed as ROS SPNM class.• Available for mineral leasing with an approved plan of operations, subject to stipulations precluding surface use of the mesa top insofar as possible (NSO).• Available for geophysical work.• Unavailable for disposal of mineral materials.• Available for mineral entry with an approved plan of operations, subject to stipulations precluding surface use of the mesa top insofar as possible.• Retained in public ownership and not classified, segregated, or withdrawn from entry.• Excluded from private or commercial use of woodland products, including limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.• Unavailable for livestock grazing, including grazing by saddle stock and pack animals allowed for access.• Excluded from land treatments or other improvements, except for test plots and facilities necessary for study of relict plant communities.• Excluded from wildlife habitat improvements.• Excluded from watershed control structures.• Subject to conditional fire suppression.• Closed to OHV use.	<p>Lavender Mesa (649 acres) (Map 51) would continue to be designated as a ACEC, and would be managed with the same management prescriptions as the Alternative A, except for the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Non-surface-disturbing vegetative treatment allowed to control invasive species and for rehabilitation of disturbed surfaces.• Managed as NSO for oil and gas leasing.• Available for locatable mineral entry with approved plan of operations (for the sides of the mesa, not the top), subject to stipulations protecting vegetation on the mesa top.• No campfires allowed.• Managed to limit recreation use if vegetation communities are being adversely impacted.• Helicopter access allowed for scientific study and heliportable equipment.• Managed as VRM Class II.	<p>Lavender Mesa (649 acres) (Map 52) would continue to be designated as a ACEC and would be managed with the same management prescriptions as Alternative A, except for the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Excluded from land treatments or other improvements, except for test plots and facilities necessary for study of the plant communities, and restoration/reclamation activities.• Managed as NSO for oil and gas leasing.• Available for locatable mineral entry with approved plan of operations, subject to stipulations protecting vegetation on the mesa top.• No campfires allowed.• Managed to limit recreation use if vegetation communities are being adversely impacted.• Geophysical exploration allowed if it does not adversely impact vegetation communities.• Managed as VRM Class II.• Helicopter access allowed for scientific study and heliportable equipment.	<p>Lavender Mesa would not be designated as an ACEC and would be managed the same as the surrounding area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mechanized/motorized travel limited to designated routes. However, it should be noted that the area is inaccessible to motorized travel or grazing.• Helicopter access allowed for scientific study and heliportable equipment.• Managed as VRM Class III.• Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products including limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.	<p>Lavender Mesa would continue to be designated as an ACEC (Map 51). It would be managed the same as Alternative B except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, closed to OHV use, ROW exclusion areas, unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, VRM Class I, and proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.</p>	<p>Lavender Mesa (649 acres) (Map 53) would continue to be designated as an ACEC and would be managed with the same management prescriptions as Alternative A, except for the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Excluded from land treatments or other improvements, except for test plots and facilities necessary for study of the plant communities, and restoration/reclamation activities.• Managed as NSO for oil and gas leasing.• Closed to disposal of mineral materials• Available for locatable mineral entry with approved plan of operations, subject to stipulations protecting vegetation on the mesa top.• No campfires allowed.• Managed to limit recreation use if vegetation communities are being adversely impacted.• Geophysical exploration allowed if it does not adversely impact vegetation communities.• Managed as VRM Class II.• Helicopter access allowed for scientific study and heliportable equipment.• ROW avoidance area.• Retained in public ownership.• Excluded from private or commercial use of woodland products, including limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.• Unavailable for livestock grazing, including grazing by saddle stock and pack animals allowed for access.• Excluded from wildlife habitat improvements.• Excluded from watershed control structures.• Appropriate management response to wildland fire in accordance with the Moab District Fire Plan.• Closed to OHV use.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

<ul style="list-style-type: none">Managed to limit recreation use if cultural resources or scenic values are being damaged.Excluded from surface disturbance by mechanized or motorized equipment, except helicopter access for scientific study and heliportable equipment, insofar as possible.					
LOCKHART BASIN ACEC—Relevance and Importance Values: Scenic and Cultural					
Lockhart Basin ACEC overlays the Indian Creek WSA (6,870 acres). WSAs are managed under the IMP, unless more restrictive management is prescribed.					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
There is not an existing ACEC for Lockhart Basin. A portion of the potential Lockhart Basin ACEC area includes the Indian Creek existing ACEC. Refer to the Indian Creek ACEC (Alternative A) for management prescriptions.	Lockhart Basin (47,783) (Map 51) acres would be designated as a ACEC and would be managed with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Managed as VRM Class I.Available for mineral leasing subject to NSO. Exemptions may be granted on a case-by-case basis if site-specific NEPA determines that VRM Class I can be met.Surface-disturbing activities would be prohibited. Exemptions may be granted on a case-by-case basis if site-specific NEPA determines that VRM Class I can be met.Available for geophysical exploration if VRM Class I can be met.Unavailable for disposal of mineral materials.Retained in public ownership and recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry.Available for livestock use.Pursue acquisition of state in-holdings in this ACEC.Open for campfires.Unavailable for woodland product use except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.	Lockhart Basin would not be designated as an ACEC. It would be managed with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Managed as VRM Class II and III.Available for mineral leasing subject to timing limitations and controlled surface use in Bighorn Sheep area, and Standard lease terms in remaining area.Retained in public ownership.Available for livestock use.Open for campfires.Unavailable for woodland product use except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.	Same as Alternative C.	Lockhart Basin (47,783) (Map 51) acres would be designated as a ACEC and would be managed the same as Alternative B except for the non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. These lands would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, closed for OHV use, ROW exclusion areas, unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, VRM Class I, and proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.	Lockhart Basin would not be designated as an ACEC. It would be managed with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Available for mineral leasing subject to timing limitations and controlled surface use in Bighorn Sheep area, and Standard lease terms in remaining area.Retained in public ownership.Available for livestock use.Managed as VRM Class II and III.OHV use limited to designated roads and trailsOpen for campfires.Unavailable for woodland product use except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.Where the ACEC intersects with the Colorado River Segment 2, it would be managed as VRM Class II, NSO for mineral leasing.Where the ACEC intersects Colorado River Segment 3, it would be managed as VRM II, unavailable for mineral leasing, closed to OHV use, and recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.
SAN JUAN RIVER ACEC—Relevance and Importance Values: Scenic, Cultural, Fish and Wildlife, Natural Systems and Processes, and Geologic Features					
A Cultural Resources Management Plan would be written for the San Juan River.					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
There is not an existing ACEC for the San Juan River. The area would continue to be managed as the San	The San Juan River (7,590 acres) (Map 51). would be designated as ACEC and would be managed with	Same as Alternative B (Map 52).	The area would not be designated as an ACEC. Recreation management	The San Juan River (7,590 acres) (Map 51) would be designated as an ACEC and managed the same as	The San Juan River (4,321 acres) (Map 53) would be designated as a ACEC. The acreage has been reduced to exclude San Juan River Segment 5 area, which was determined Suitable for Wild

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

Juan River SRMA (15,100 acres).	<p>the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Vehicle access, including OHVs/mechanized, limited to designated routes.• Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires; woodland use within the floodplain would be limited to collection of driftwood for campfires.• Available for livestock use October 1–May 31. (Grazing must incorporate rest-rotation and/or deferred management systems. Riparian areas must meet or exceed PFC to the extent affected by grazing.• Available for watershed, range, wildlife habitat improvements and vegetation treatments.• West Montezuma Creek to Private land managed as VRM Class II.• West of accreted land at Town of Bluff to River mile 9 managed as VRM Class III.• River mile 9 to river mile 23 (above Mexican Hat formation) managed as VRM Class I.• River mile 23.8 to river mile 28 managed as VRM Class III.• River mile 28 to Glen Canyon NRA managed as VRM Class I.• Available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO.• Unavailable for mineral material disposal.• Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.• Managed to limit recreation use if wildlife values are being adversely impacted.• Camping closed in areas as necessary to protect cultural, wildlife, and natural processes.• Designated access trails to cultural sites as necessary to protect cultural resources.• No camping in cultural sites.• Ropes and other climbing aids not allowed for access to ruins,		<p>prescriptions identified under the San Juan River SRMA in the Recreation Section of this Chapter would also be followed.</p>	<p>Alternative B except: non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, closed to OHV use, ROW exclusion areas, unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, VRM Class I, and proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry. Recreation management prescriptions identified under the San Juan River SRMA in the Recreation Section of this Chapter would also be followed.</p>	<p>and Scenic River designation (see Wild and Scenic River section of this Chapter for management prescriptions.) The ACEC would be managed with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Vehicle access, including OHVs/mechanized, limited to designated routes.• Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires; woodland use within the floodplain would be limited to collection of driftwood for campfires.• Available for livestock use October 1–May 31. (Grazing must incorporate rest-rotation and/or deferred management systems. Riparian areas must meet or exceed PFC to the extent affected by grazing.• Available for watershed, range, wildlife habitat improvements and vegetation treatments.• West Montezuma Creek to Private land managed as VRM Class II.• West of accreted land at Town of Bluff to River mile 9 managed as VRM Class III.• River mile 9 to river mile 23 (above Mexican Hat formation) managed as VRM Class I.• River mile 23.8 to river mile 28 managed as VRM Class III.• Available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO.• Unavailable for mineral material disposal.• Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.• Managed to limit recreation use if wildlife values are being adversely impacted.• Camping closed in areas as necessary to protect cultural, wildlife, and natural processes.• Designated access trails to cultural sites as necessary to protect cultural resources.• No camping in cultural sites.• Ropes and other climbing aids not allowed for access to ruins, cultural sites, and nesting raptors.• San Juan River Segments 1, 2 and 3 would be ROW avoidance areas.• Recreation management prescriptions identified under the San Juan River SRMA in the Recreation Section of this Chapter would also be followed and is consistent with the management outlined above.
---------------------------------	---	--	---	---	--

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

	<p>cultural sites, and nesting raptors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Recreation management prescriptions identified under the San Juan River SRMA in the Recreation Section of this Chapter would also be followed and is consistent with the management outlined above.				
SCENIC HIGHWAY CORRIDOR ACEC—Relevance and Importance Value: Scenic					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
<p>For the 21,380 acres where the Scenic Highway Corridor ACEC (79,017 acres) (Map 50) overlaps the Cedar Mesa ACEC (295,336 acres), the special conditions for Scenic Highway Corridor ACEC would take precedence.</p> <p>Special conditions for the Corridor would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Open for mineral leasing with stipulations to prevent surface occupancy (Category 3); however, the area manager would grant an exception to the NSO stipulation in the event it is determined, through an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement, if necessary, with the adoption and use of appropriate mitigation measures, that the project would meet visual quality standards.• Available for disposal of mineral materials subject to visual quality considerations.• Managed to limit recreation use if scenic values are being damaged.• Managed as VRM Class I with projects that meet these visual quality standards allowed.	<p>The Scenic Highway Corridor would not be designated as an ACEC.</p> <p>The scenic values would be protected throughout this linear feature through management prescription for the overlying SRMAs, WSAs, ACECs, among others.</p>	<p>The Scenic Highway Corridor would not be designated as an ACEC.</p> <p>The scenic values would be protected throughout this linear feature through management prescription for the overlying SRMAs, WSAs, ACECs, among others.</p>	<p>The Scenic Highway Corridor would not be designated as an ACEC.</p> <p>The scenic values would be protected throughout this linear feature through management prescription for the overlying SRMAs, WSAs, ACECs, among others.</p>	<p>The Scenic Highway Corridor would not be designated as an ACEC.</p> <p>The scenic values would be protected throughout this linear feature through management prescription for the overlying SRMAs, WSAs, ACECs, non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, among others.</p>	<p>The Scenic Highway Corridor would not be designated as an ACEC.</p> <p>The scenic values would be protected throughout this linear feature through management prescription for the overlying SRMAs, WSAs, ACECs, among others.</p>
SHAY CANYON ACEC—Relevance and Importance Value: Cultural					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
<p>Shay Canyon ACEC (3,561 acres) (Map 50): Cultural and Special Emphasis Area for conservation value would be maintained with the following management prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Where riparian areas overlap part of Shay Canyon ACEC, the special conditions for floodplains	<p>Shay Canyon (119 acres) (Map 51) would be designated as a ACEC and would be managed with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A CRMP would be written for Shay Canyon ACEC.• OHV and mechanized travel limited to designated routes.• No surface disturbance for	<p>Same as Alternative B (Map 52).</p>	<p>Shay Canyon would not be designated as an ACEC. It would be managed the same as the surrounding area, with the following prescriptions;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Open to grazing.• Managed as VRM Class III.• OHV use limited to designated routes.	<p>Same as Alternative B (Map 51) except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, as unavailable for OHV use, as ROW exclusion areas, as unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, as unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, as VRM Class I, and as proposed</p>	<p>Shay Canyon (119 acres) (Map 53) would be designated as a ACEC and would be managed with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• OHV and mechanized travel limited to designated routes.• No surface disturbance for vegetation, watershed, or wildlife treatments/improvements.• NSO for oil and gas.• Open to geophysical exploration as long as it is consistent with the objectives of the ACEC.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

<p>and riparian/aquatic areas would take precedence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Within Shay Canyon ACEC, cultural properties eligible for NRHP would be surrounded by a buffer sufficient to allow permanent protection. If cultural resources or their buffers cannot be avoided, appropriate mitigation would be applied ranging from limited testing to extensive excavation.• In any given case, mitigation would be designed to fit the specific circumstances and reviewed by the SHPO and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. The Cedar Mesa Management Plan developed for the ACEC would guide fire protection, data recovery, and all other necessary cultural management activities.• Revegetation must be successfully established within 5 years after project completion.• Available for mineral leasing; surface use limited by special conditions.• Available for geophysical work.• Available for disposal of mineral materials.• Available for mineral entry with an approved plan of operations.• Retained in public ownership and not classified, segregated, or withdrawn from entry.• Excluded from private and commercial use of woodland products, except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.• Available for livestock use.• Managed as VRM Class I, with projects that meet these visual quality standards allowed.• Subject to conditional fire suppression.• OHV use limited to designated roads/trails.• Open for improvements in habitat and watershed.• Special Emphasis Area (corridor averaging 275 feet wide centered	<p>vegetation, watershed, or wildlife treatments/improvements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• NSO for mineral leasing.• Open to geophysical exploration as long as it is consistent with the objectives of the ACEC.• Grazing restricted to trailing only.• With the exception of side canyons, hiking limited to designated trails.• Open to mineral entry with an approved plan of operations to avoid impacts to cultural and paleontological resources.• Closed to disposal of mineral materials.• Campfires not allowed.• Unavailable for private or commercial use of woodland products including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.• Recreation use may be limited if cultural and paleontological resources are impacted.• Managed as VRM Class II.• Closed to camping.		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Unavailable for private or commercial use of woodland products including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.	<p>for withdrawal from mineral entry.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Grazing restricted to trailing only.• With the exception of side canyons, hiking limited to designated trails.• Open to mineral entry with an approved plan of operations to avoid impacts to cultural and paleontological resources.• Closed to disposal of mineral materials.• Campfires not allowed.• Unavailable for private or commercial use of woodland products including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.• Recreation use may be limited if cultural and paleontological resources are impacted.• Managed as VRM Class II.• Closed to camping.• ROW avoidance area.• A Cultural CRMP consistent with the goals and objectives of this RMP would be written for Shay Canyon ACEC and would not require a plan amendment to RMP.
--	--	--	---	---	---

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

on [upper] Indian Creek): Managed to maintain and enhance riparian/aquatic habitat quality and to increase the extent of fishery habitat.					
VALLEY OF THE GODS ACEC—Relevance and Importance Value: Scenic					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Valley of the Gods: (31,387 acres) Special Emphasis Area for Scenic Value within the Cedar Mesa ACEC. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Surface disturbance would be managed to be compatible with VRM Class I criteria.• Surface disturbance would be limited to what can be successfully established within 1 year after project completion. Revegetation must be with native species naturally occurring in the vicinity.• Available for mineral leasing, NSO; however, the manager would grant an exception to the NSO stipulation in the event it is determined through an EA (or EIS, if necessary) that with the adoption and use of appropriate mitigation measures, the project would meet visual quality standards for the area.• Available for geophysical work.• Available for disposal of mineral materials with an approved plan of operations.• Available for mineral entry with an approved plan of operations.• Retained in public ownership and not classified, segregated, or withdrawn from entry.• Available for private and commercial use of woodland.• Open for livestock use.• Managed as VRM Class I.• OHV use limited to designated roads and trails.• Subject to conditional fire suppression.	Valley of the Gods (22,863 acres) (Map 51) would be designated as an ACEC and would be managed with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Managed as VRM Class I.• Unavailable for mineral leasing.• Closed to the disposal of mineral materials.• Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.• Available for vegetation treatments if meets VRM Class I objectives.• No campfires allowed.• Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products.• The BLM would pursue acquisition of state in-holdings in this ACEC.• Valley of the Gods ACEC lies within the Cedar Mesa SRMA. Recreational management prescriptions including limitations on group size, pets and stock animals are provided. See Recreation section in this Chapter under Cedar Mesa SRMA.	Valley of the Gods (22,863 acres) (Map 52) would be designated as an ACEC and would be managed the same as Alternative B. Valley of the Gods ACEC lies within the Cedar Mesa SRMA. Recreational management prescriptions including limitations on group size, pets and stock animals are provided. See Recreation section in this Chapter under Cedar Mesa SRMA.	Valley of the Gods would not be designated as an ACEC.	Valley of the Gods (22,863 acres) (Map 51) would be designated as an ACEC. Management would be the same as Alternative B except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, closed to OHV use, ROW exclusion areas, unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, VRM Class I, and proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry. Valley of the Gods ACEC lies within the Cedar Mesa SRMA. Recreational management prescriptions including limitations on group size, pets and stock animals are provided. See Recreation section in this Chapter under Cedar Mesa SRMA.	Valley of the Gods (22,863 acres) (Map 53) would be designated as an ACEC and would be managed with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Managed as VRM Class I.• Unavailable for mineral leasing.• Closed to the disposal of mineral materials.• Available for mineral entry with an approved plan of operations.• Available for vegetation treatments when consistent with VRM Class 1.• Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products.• The BLM would pursue acquisition of state in-holdings in this ACEC.• OHV use limited to designated roads and trails• ROW exclusion area.• No campfires allowed.
SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS—WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS					
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES					
Review all eligible rivers to determine suitability for congressional designation into the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System (NWSRS). To the extent of the BLM's authority (limited to BLM lands within the river corridor), maintain and enhance the free-flowing character, preserve and enhance the ORVs, and allow no activities within the river corridor that would alter the tentative classification of those					

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

river segments determined suitable for congressional designation into the NWSRS until Congress acts on the designation.					
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ALTERNATIVES <p>River segments found suitable and/or recommended for designation would be managed in accordance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to protect the free-flowing nature of the river/segment, the tentative classification level, and to prevent impairment of the outstandingly remarkable values within 0.25 mile from high water mark on each side of the river not to exceed 320 acres per mile. On the San Juan River the area would be 0.25 mile from high water mark on the north side not to exceed 160 acres per mile. On the San Juan River, the BLM has jurisdiction on the lands north of the river; and the Navajo Nation has jurisdiction on the southern side of the river. The BLM would coordinate with the Navajo Nation in developing consistent management of the river.</p> <p>The White Canyon had a river segment found eligible in the 1991 San Juan Resource Management Plan. There were 30 miles from the Manti-La Sal National Forest boundary to the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area that were studied at that time. A new eligibility evaluation was conducted in 2004 (Appendix H, page 80), which determined this segment did not meet the eligibility criteria outlined in BLM policy due to a lack of intermittent or perennial flow. For this reason it was not carried forward for suitability study into this RMP revision.</p> <p>Management prescriptions for designated WSRs are listed in the BLM Manual 8351, WSRs—Policy and Program Direction for Identification, Evaluation, and Management (BLM 1993b) by tentative classification: wild, scenic, and recreational.</p> <p>The BLM would work with state, local, and tribal governments, and other federal agencies, in a state-wide study, to reach consensus regarding recommendations to Congress for the inclusion of rivers in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. Besides applying consistent criteria across agency jurisdictions, the joint study would avoid piecemealing of river segments in logical watershed units in the state. The study would evaluate, in detail, the possible benefits and effects of designation on the local and state economies, agricultural and industrial operations and interests, outdoor recreation, natural resources (including the outstandingly remarkable values for which the river was deemed suitable), water rights, water quality, water resource planning, and access to and across river corridors within, and upstream and downstream from the proposed segment(s). Actual designation of river segments would only occur through congressional action or as a result of Secretarial decision at the request of the governor in accordance with provisions of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (the Act). The BLM will work with the state, local, and tribal governments, and the agencies involved to coordinate its decision making on WSR issues and to achieve consistency wherever possible.</p> <p>The BLM recognizes that water resources on most river and stream segments within the State of Utah are already fully allocated. Before stream segments that have been recommended as suitable under this Proposed Plan are recommended to Congress for designation, the BLM will continue to work with affected local, state, federal, and tribal partners to identify in-stream flows necessary to meet critical resource needs, including values related to the subject segment(s). Such quantifications would be included in any recommendation for designation. The BLM would then seek to jointly promote innovative strategies, community-based planning, and voluntary agreements with water users, under State law, to address those needs.</p> <p>Should designations occur on any river segment as a result of Secretarial or congressional action, existing rights, privileges, and contracts would be protected. Under Section 12 of the Act, termination of such rights, privileges, and contracts may happen only with the consent of the affected non-federal party. A determination by the BLM of eligibility and suitability for the inclusion of rivers on public lands to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System does not create new water rights for the BLM. Federal reserved water rights for new components of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System are established at the discretion of Congress. If water is reserved by Congress when a river component is added to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, it would come from water that is not appropriated at the time of designation, in the amount necessary to protect features, which led to the river's inclusion into the system. The BLM's intent would be to leave existing water rights undisturbed and to recognize the lawful rights of private, municipal, and state entities to manage water resources under state law to meet the needs of the community. Federal law, including Section 13 of the Act and the McCarren Amendment (43 United States Code [U.S.C.] 666), recognizes state jurisdiction over water allocation in designated streams. Thus, it is the BLM's position that existing water rights, including flows apportioned to the State of Utah interstate agreements and compacts, including the Upper Colorado River Compact, and developments of such rights would not be affected by designation or the creation of the possible federal reserved water right. The BLM would seek to work with upstream and downstream water users and applicable agencies to ensure that water flows are maintained at a level sufficient to sustain the values for which affected river segments were designated.</p>					
Colorado River Segment 1 (Maps 54 and 55)					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Recommendation: This segment of the Colorado River was not evaluated for eligibility in the 1991 San Juan RMP (see Segments 2 and 3 below).	Recommendation: Suitable—Recreational Size: 352 acres Location: Northern-most Monticello PA boundary, east side of Colorado River (1 mile north of Potash land) south of private land. Total river miles: 6.2 BLM river miles: 2.2 This segment would be managed with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">VRM Class III.Available for oil and gas leasing subject to standard lease terms, except for floodplains and riparian corridors, which would be managed as available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO.	Recommendation: Not suitable.	Recommendation: Not suitable.	Same as Alternative B.	Recommendation: Not suitable.
Colorado River Segment 2 (Maps 54 and 55)					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Recommendation: The Colorado River was determined eligible in the 1991 San Juan RMP; suitability was not evaluated at that time. Location: From state lands near	Recommendation: Suitable—Scenic. Size: 880 acres Location: State lands near river	Recommendation: Suitable—Scenic. Size: 880 acres Location: State lands near river mile	Recommendation: Not suitable.	Same as Alternative B except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed unavailable for mineral leasing, closed to OHV use, ROW exclusion	Recommendation: Suitable—Scenic. Size: 880 acres Location: State lands near river mile 44 to approximately river mile 38.5 (5.5 miles).

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

river mile 44 to the boundary of Canyonlands National Park, 12.5 miles. The eligible segment includes the BLM portion of the Colorado River, from the north line of public land south of the San Juan County line down river to the north boundary of Canyonlands National Park. This segment would be managed under special conditions for floodplains and riparian/aquatic areas (entire 12.5-mile segment) and SPNM class (lower 9.5-mile segment). Floodplains and riparian/aquatic areas would be: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Available for mineral leasing with stipulations to prevent surface occupancy within actual floodplains or riparian/aquatic areas (Category 3).• Managed as ROS SPNM. Note: These stipulations apply to proposed Colorado River Segments 2 and 3.	mile 44 to approximately river mile 38.5. Total river miles: 6.8 BLM river miles: 5.5 miles This segment would be managed with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• VRM Class II.• Available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO.	44 to approximately river mile 38.5 (5.5 miles). This segment would be managed with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• VRM Class II.• Available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO.• Motorized boat use allowed on the river.		areas, unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, VRM Class I, and proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.	This segment would be managed with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• VRM Class II.• Available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO.• Motorized boat use allowed on the river.• ROW avoidance area. Total river miles: 6.8 BLM river miles: 6.8
Colorado River Segment 3 (Maps 54 and 55)					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
See management prescriptions above.	Recommendation: Suitable—Scenic. Size: 1,040 acres Location: From approximately river mile 37.5 at state land to boundary of Canyonlands National Park near river mile 31. Total river miles: 6.5 BLM river miles: 6.5 This segment would be managed with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• VRM Class I.• Unavailable for oil and gas leasing.• Closed to OHV use.• Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.• Closed to motorized boat use.	Recommendation: Suitable—(Scenic). Size: 1,040 acres Location: From approximately river mile 37.5 at state land to boundary of Canyonlands National Park near river mile 31 (6.5 miles). This segment would be managed with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• VRM Class I.• Unavailable for oil and gas leasing.• Closed to OHV use.• Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.• Closed to motorized boat use.	Recommendation: Not suitable.	Same as Alternative B except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed unavailable for mineral leasing, closed to OHV use, ROW exclusion areas, unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, VRM Class I, and proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.	Recommendation: Suitable—Scenic Size: 1,040 acres Location: From approximately river mile 37.5 at state land to boundary of Canyonlands National Park near river mile 31 (6.5 miles). This segment would be managed with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• VRM Class I• Unavailable for oil and gas leasing.• Closed to OHV use.• Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.• Motorized boat use allowed on the river• ROW exclusion area. Total river miles: 6.5 BLM river miles: 6.5
Indian Creek (Maps 54 and 55)					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Recommendation: This segment of Indian Creek was not evaluated for eligibility in the 1991 San Juan RMP.	Recommendation: Suitable—Recreational. Size: 1,536 acres Location: Forest boundary to	Recommendation: Not suitable.	Recommendation: Not suitable.	Same as Alternative B except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed unavailable for mineral leasing, closed to OHV use, ROW exclusion	Recommendation: Not suitable.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

	Donnelly Canyon. Total river miles: 6.5 BLM river miles: 4.8 miles This segment would be managed with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">VRM Class III.Available for oil and gas leasing subject to standard lease terms, except for floodplains and riparian corridors, which would be available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO.OHV travel would be limited to designated routes.			areas, unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, VRM Class I, and proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.	
Fable Valley (Maps 54 and 55)					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Recommendation: This segment of Fable Valley was not evaluated for eligibility in the 1991 San Juan RMP.	Recommendation: Suitable—Scenic. Size: 2,176 acres Location: Source to mouth at Gypsum Creek Total river miles: 6.8 BLM river miles: 6.8 Recommended as Suitable—Scenic. This segment would be managed with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">VRM Class I.Unavailable for oil and gas leasing.Managed per IMP.	Recommendation: Not suitable.	Recommendation: Not suitable.	Same as Alternative B except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed unavailable for mineral leasing, closed to OHV use, ROW exclusion areas, unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, VRM Class I, and proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.	Recommendation: Not suitable.
Dark Canyon (Maps 54 and 55)					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Recommendation: This segment of Dark Canyon was not evaluated for eligibility in the 1991 San Juan RMP.	Recommendation: Suitable—Wild. Size: 2,048 acres Location: Forest boundary to Glen Canyon NRA below Young's Canyon. Total river miles: 13.6 BLM river miles: 6.4 This segment would be managed with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">VRM Class I.Unavailable for oil and gas leasing.Closed to OHV use.Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative B.	Recommendation: Not suitable.	Same as Alternative B except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed unavailable for mineral leasing, closed to OHV use, ROW exclusion areas, unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, VRM Class I, and proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.	Recommendation: Suitable—Wild. Size: 2,048 acres Location: Forest boundary to Glen Canyon NRA below Young's Canyon. Total river miles: 13.6 BLM river miles: 6.4 This segment would be managed with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">VRM Class I.Unavailable for oil and gas leasing.Closed to OHV use.Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.
San Juan River Segment 1 (Maps 54 and 55)					

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Recommendation: This segment of the San Juan River and the upper portion of proposed Segment 2 were not evaluated for eligibility in the 1991 San Juan RMP (see Segments 2, 3, 4, and 5 below).	Recommendation: Suitable—Recreational. Size: 1,360 acres Location: West Montezuma Creek to private land just before "avulsed" parcel of Navajo land at St. Christopher's Mission. Total river miles: 15.3 BLM River Miles: 8.5 This segment would be managed with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">VRM Class III.Available for oil and gas leasing subject to standard lease terms except for floodplains and riparian corridors which would be available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO.	Recommendation: Not suitable.	Recommendation: Not suitable.	Same as Alternative B.	Recommendation: Not suitable.
San Juan River Segment 2(Maps 54 and 55)					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
San Juan River (This description covers a portion of proposed San Juan River Segment 2 and all of proposed Segments 3, 4, and 5.) The eligible segment includes the BLM portion of the San Juan River from the bridge on US Highway 191 south of Bluff to the Glen Canyon NRA boundary. This segment would be managed under the special conditions listed below: ROS P-Class Conditions for San Juan River <ul style="list-style-type: none">Excluded from private and commercial use of woodland products, except for on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.Available for livestock use.Excluded from new land treatments.Managed to allow cultural resources to remain subject to natural forces.Managed as VRM Class I, with only those projects that meet class-I objective allowed; subject to conditional fire suppression, with motorized suppression methods used only if necessary to protect life and property.Excluded from surface	Recommendation: Suitable—Recreational. Size: 1,600 acres Location: West of "accreted" land at town of Bluff, Utah at river mile (minus) -1 to river mile 9. Total river miles: 10 BLM river miles: 10 This segment would be managed with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">VRM Class III.Available for oil and gas leasing subject to standard lease terms except for floodplains and riparian corridors which would be managed as available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO.	Recommendation: Not suitable.	Recommendation: Not suitable.	Same as Alternative B.	Recommendation: Not suitable.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

disturbance by mechanized or motorized equipment. Semiprimitive Motorized (SPM) Class within San Juan River SRMA The SPM-class area within San Juan River SPRA (9,380 acres) would be managed under certain conditions listed above for P-class areas, except that motorized boat use on San Juan River would be allowed. This area would be managed to maintain an environment of isolation insofar as allowed by river permit and patrol system. Levels of management and use are aimed at maintaining safety and the riverine ecosystem. The following special conditions are in addition to those listed above for P-class areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The area would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.• Surface disturbance from mining activities on existing claims would be limited to the extent possible without curtailing valid existing rights.• The area above the rim in the vicinity of the Bluff airport lease would be available for mineral material disposal.• Except for motorized boat use on the San Juan River, no vehicle access would be allowed from Comb Wash downstream to Lime Creek and south of Mexican Hat bridge. In areas closed to OHV use, a plan of operations is required for any mining-related activity other than casual use. In other areas within the SRMA, vehicle access would be limited to designated roads and trails.					
San Juan River Segment 3 (Maps 54 and 55)					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
See management prescriptions above.	Recommendation: Suitable—Wild. Size: 2,128 acres Location: River mile 9 to river mile 23 above the Mexican Hat formation. Total river miles: 13.3 BLM river miles: 13.3	Recommendation: Not suitable.	Recommendation: Not suitable.	Same as Alternative B except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed unavailable for mineral leasing, closed to OHV use, ROW exclusion areas, unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, unavailable for private and commercial woodland	Recommendation: Not suitable.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

	<p>This segment would be managed with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• VRM Class I.• Unavailable for oil and gas leasing.• Closed to OHV use.• Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.			harvest, VRM Class I, and proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.	
San Juan River Segment 4 (Maps 54 and 55)					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
See management prescriptions above.	<p>Recommendation: Suitable—Recreational.</p> <p>Size: 672 acres</p> <p>Location: River mile 23.8 west to river mile 28.</p> <p>Total river miles: 5.3 BLM river miles: 4.2</p> <p>This segment would be managed with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• VRM Class III.• Available for oil and gas leasing subject to standard lease terms, except for floodplains and riparian corridors, which would be available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO.	<p>Recommendation: Not suitable.</p>	<p>Recommendation: Not Suitable</p>	Same as Alternative B except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed unavailable for mineral leasing, closed to OHV use, ROW exclusion areas, unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, VRM Class I, and proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.	<p>Recommendation: Not suitable.</p>
San Juan River Segment 5 (Maps 54 and 55)					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
See management prescriptions above.	<p>Recommendation: Suitable—Wild.</p> <p>Size: 2,768 acres</p> <p>Location: River mile 28 to Glen Canyon NRA at river mile 45.</p> <p>Total river miles: 17.3 BLM river miles: 17.3</p> <p>This segment would be managed with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• VRM Class I.• Available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO.• Closed to OHV use.• Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.	<p>Recommendation: Not suitable.</p>	<p>Recommendation: Not suitable.</p>	Same as Alternative B.	<p>Recommendation: Suitable—Wild.</p> <p>Size: 2,768 acres</p> <p>Location: River mile 28 to Glen Canyon NRA at river mile 45.</p> <p>Total river miles: 17.3 BLM river miles: 17.3</p> <p>This segment would be managed with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• VRM Class I.• Closed to oil and gas leasing• Closed to OHV use.• Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.• ROW exclusion area.
Arch Canyon (Maps 54 and 55)					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
This segment was not evaluated for eligibility in the 1991 San Juan RMP.	<p>Recommendation: Suitable—Recreational.</p> <p>Size: 2,208 acres</p> <p>Location: Forest boundary to 0.5 mile west of its confluence with</p>	<p>Recommendation: Not suitable.</p>	<p>Recommendation: Not suitable.</p>	Same as Alternative B.	<p>Recommendation: Not suitable.</p>

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

	Comb Wash. Total river miles: 7.7 BLM river miles: 6.9 This segment would be managed with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">VRM Class III.Open to oil and gas leasing subject to standard lease terms, except for floodplains and riparian corridors, which would be managed as open to oil and gas leasing subject to NSO.				
SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS—WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS (MAP 56)					
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES					
Manage FLPMA Section 603 WSAs in a manner that does not impair their suitability for congressional designation into the National Wilderness Preservation System.					
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ALTERNATIVES					
<p>All lands studied during the FLPMA Section 603 wilderness review will continue to be managed in a manner that does not impair their suitability for congressional designation in accordance with FLPMA Section 603(c), subject to valid existing rights. Actions may be allowed on a case-by-case basis only where the BLM determines that such action would not impair the lands' wilderness suitability.</p> <p>The Monticello FO manages 13 WSAs [389,444 acres as identified in the Statewide Report to Congress and (386,027 GIS acres)]: Mancos Mesa (51,440 acres), Grand Gulch ISA Complex (105,520), Road Canyon (52,420), Fish Creek Canyon (46,440), Mule Canyon (5,990), Cheesebox Canyon (15,410), Dark Canyon ISA Complex (68,030), Butler Wash (24,190), Bridger Jack Mesa (5,290), Indian Creek (6,870), South Needles (160), Squaw and Papoose Canyons (6,676), Cross Canyon (1,008).</p> <p>Only Congress can release a WSA from wilderness consideration. Should any WSA, in part or in whole, be released from wilderness consideration, examine proposals in the released area on a case-by-case basis for consistency with the goals and objectives of the RMP decisions. Actions inconsistent with RMP goals and objectives would be deferred until completion of requisite plan amendments. Because the management direction of the released land would continue in accordance with the goals and objectives established in the RMP, no separate analysis is required in this LUP to address resource impacts if any WSAs are released by Congress.</p> <p>Within the area managed by the Monticello FO, there is an area totaling 2,155 acres contiguous to the Butler Wash WSA that was studied as a boundary variation during the wilderness review mandated by Congress in FLPMA Sections 603(a) and (b). These lands were addressed in the Utah BLM Statewide Wilderness Final EIS (November, 1990) and were recommended for congressional wilderness designation in the Utah Statewide Wilderness Study Reports (October, 1991). This recommendation was forwarded by the President of the United States to Congress in 1993. The lands would continue to be managed in a manner that does not impair their suitability for congressional designation in accordance with FLPMA Section 603(c). Subject to valid existing rights, the only case-by-case actions that would be considered would be those where it is determined that wilderness suitability would not be adversely impacted. Lands within this administratively endorsed area are not under IMP management. This RMP would make decisions to protect those lands until Congress acts.</p> <p>WSAs are managed in a manner consistent with the Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review (IMP) (BLM 1995). The only decisions related to WSA management that would be made in this plan are VRM, OHV designations, and conditional use of specific ways. Any ways established for use through this planning effort must have been previously identified during the initial wilderness inventory.</p> <p>WSA management prescriptions, as stipulated in the IMP, would take precedence over other management prescriptions throughout this RMP, unless the other management prescriptions are more restrictive.</p> <p>Only Congress can release a WSA from wilderness consideration. Actions inconsistent with RMP goals and objectives would be deferred until completion of requisite plan amendments. Should any WSA, in part or in whole, be released by Congress from wilderness consideration, proposals in the released area would be examined on a case-by-case basis for consistency with the goals and objectives of the RMP decisions. Because the management direction of the released land would continue in accordance with the goals and objectives established in the RMP, there is no separate analysis required in this LUP to address resource impacts if any WSAs are released.</p> <p>Where vehicle ways would remain available for motorized use within WSAs, such use could continue on a conditional basis. Use of the existing routes in the WSAs ("ways" when located within WSAs—see Glossary) could continue as long as the use of these ways does not impair wilderness suitability, as provided by the IMP. If Congress designates the area as wilderness, the routes will be closed. In the interim, if use and/or noncompliance are found through monitoring efforts to impair the area's suitability for wilderness designation, the BLM would take further action to limit use of the ways or close them. The continued use of these ways, therefore, is based on user compliance and nonimpairment of wilderness values.</p>					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Manage to a VRM Class I objectives. Manage OHV use as (Map 58): <ul style="list-style-type: none">Mancos Mesa: closedDark Canyon ISA: closedGrand Gulch ISA: closed and limitedFish Creek Canyon: closed and limitedRoad Canyon: closed and limitedMule Canyon: limitedCheesebox Canyon: limited	Designated as VRM Class I. Manage OHV use as (Map 59): <ul style="list-style-type: none">Mancos Mesa: closedDark Canyon ISA: closedGrand Gulch ISA: closedFish Creek Canyon: closedRoad Canyon: closedMule Canyon: closedCheesebox Canyon: closedButler Wash and associated administratively endorsed lands:	Designated as VRM Class I. Manage OHV use as (Map 60): <ul style="list-style-type: none">Mancos Mesa: closedDark Canyon ISA: closedGrand Gulch ISA: closedFish Creek Canyon: closedRoad Canyon: closedMule Canyon: closedCheesebox Canyon: closedButler Wash and associated administratively endorsed lands:	Designated as VRM Class I. Manage OHV use as (Map 61): <ul style="list-style-type: none">Mancos Mesa: limitedDark Canyon ISA: limitedGrand Gulch ISA: limitedFish Creek Canyon: limitedRoad Canyon: limitedMule Canyon: limitedCheesebox Canyon: limitedButler Wash and associated administratively endorsed lands:	Designated as VRM Class I. Manage OHV use as (Map 62): <ul style="list-style-type: none">Mancos Mesa: closedDark Canyon ISA: closedGrand Gulch ISA: closedFish Creek Canyon: closedRoad Canyon: closedMule Canyon: closedCheesebox Canyon: closedButler Wash and associated administratively endorsed lands:	Designated as VRM Class I. Manage OHV use as (Map 63): <ul style="list-style-type: none">Mancos Mesa: closedDark Canyon ISA: closedGrand Gulch ISA Complex: closedFish Creek Canyon: closedRoad Canyon: closedMule Canyon: closedCheesebox Canyon: closedButler Wash/administratively endorsed lands: closedIndian Creek: closed

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

<ul style="list-style-type: none">Butler Wash: closedIndian Creek: closedSquaw and Papoose Canyon: limited (by IMP)Cross Canyon: limited (by IMP)Bridger Jack Mesa: closedSouth Needles: closed	<p>closed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Indian Creek: closedSquaw and Papoose Canyon: closedCross Canyon: closedBridger Jack Mesa: closedSouth Needles: closed	<p>closed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Indian Creek: closedSquaw and Papoose Canyon: closedCross Canyon: closedBridger Jack Mesa: closedSouth Needles: closed <p>Within the Grand Gulch ISA Complex, Fish Creek Canyon WSA, Road Canyon WSA, and Mancos Mesa WSA, there remain 7 ways that would continue to temporarily provide motorized access to existing trailheads. These trailheads would be relocated outside of the WSA boundary and rehabilitated in the future.</p>	<p>limited</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Indian Creek: limitedSquaw and Papoose Canyon: limitedCross Canyon: limitedBridger Jack Mesa: limitedSouth Needles: limited	<p>closed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Indian Creek: closedSquaw and Papoose Canyon: closedCross Canyon: closedBridger Jack Mesa: closedSouth Needles: closed	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Squaw and Papoose Canyon: closedCross Canyon: closedBridger Jack Mesa: closedSouth Needles: closed <p>Note: Three WSAs (Fish Creek, Road Canyon, and Grand Gulch) would allow for temporary, conditional motorized use of several ways (four, or fewer) to provide recreational access to existing trailheads. Trailheads would be relocated outside of the WSAs and the ways rehabilitated at a future date.⁶</p>
SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS—HISTORIC TRAILS					
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ALTERNATIVES <p>The designated Old Spanish National Historic Trail would be managed to protect the resource values for which it was designated (Public Law 107-325). Hole in the Rock Trail would be managed for Heritage Tourism in consultation with Utah State Historic Preservation Office and Native American tribes, as well as interested stakeholder groups. The BLM would coordinate with the NPS and other managing agencies in management of the Old Spanish National Historic Trail. All interpretation projects would be done in consultation with Native Americans and other interested parties including the Old Spanish Trail Association and NPS.</p>					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
BLM and NPS are co-administrators of the Old Spanish National Historic Trail (Map 50) and currently involved in the development of a comprehensive management plan for the trail. The trail would be managed to protect the resource values for which it was designated (Public Law 107-325).	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Segments (linear) of the Old Spanish National Historic Trail (Map 51) would be identified and classified for historic integrity and condition. These segments would then be designated for appropriate types of travel.Special Recreation Permits (SRPs) on the Old Spanish National Historic Trail would be authorized only for heritage tours and reenactments.	<p>Same as Alternative B except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Landmarks (structures) along the Old Spanish National Historic Trail (Map 52) would be identified for historic integrity and interpreted only if the action would not impact the values at the site.	Same as Alternative C.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Segments (linear) of the Old Spanish National Historic Trail (Map 51) would be identified and classified for historic integrity and condition. These segments would then be designated for appropriate types of travel.SRPs on the Old Spanish National Historic Trail would be authorized only for heritage tours and reenactments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Segments (linear) of the Old Spanish National Historic Trail (Map 53) would be identified and classified for historic integrity and condition. These segments would then be designated for appropriate types of travel.Special Recreation Permits (SRPs) on the Old Spanish National Historic Trail would be authorized only for heritage tours and reenactments.Landmarks (structures) along the Old Spanish National Historic Trail would be identified for historic integrity and interpreted only if the action would not impact the values at the site.Segments of the Hole in the Rock Trail would be identified and evaluated for historic integrity and appropriate use.Landmark (structures, features) would be interpreted only if the action would not impact the values of the site/landmark

⁶ This is an implementation-level decision that cannot be protested under the planning regulations. Please see the cover letter for further information.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES					
<p>GOALS AND OBJECTIVES</p> <p>Maintain, protect, and enhance habitats (including but not limited to designated critical habitat) of federally listed Threatened, Endangered, or Candidate plant or animal species to actively promote recovery to the point that they no longer need protection or prevent the listing of species under the Endangered Species Act.</p> <p>Maintain, protect, and enhance habitats of the BLM State Director's sensitive plant and animal species to ensure that actions requiring authorization or approval by the BLM are consistent with the conservation needs of special status species and do not contribute to the need to list any special status species, either under provisions of ESA or other provisions in the BLM Manual 6840 (BLM 2001c).</p> <p>Develop and implement conservation measures to minimize long-term habitat fragmentation through avoidance and site-specific reclamation to provide habitat quality and quantity adequate to fulfill the life history requirements and to support a natural diversity of species.</p>					
<p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ALTERNATIVES</p> <p>Threatened and Endangered species conservation measures and lease notices would be used for all surface-disturbing activities to comply with the Endangered Species Act, and the BLM Manual 6840, Special Status Species Management. See Appendix A, B and Q. These species include: California Condor, Mexican Spotted Owl, Southwestern Willow Flycatcher, Yellow-Billed Cuckoo, Bonytail, Colorado Pikeminnow, Humpback Chub, Razorback Sucker, Black-Footed Ferret and Navajo Sedge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Appendix A includes stipulations applicable to Oil and Gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities regarding the 10 listed and candidate species (Maps 91, 92, and 93).• Appendix B provides wildland fire protection/management measures for special status species.• Appendix Q provides the finalized conservation measures and BMPs for T&E species resulting from programmatic Section 7 Consultation with USFWS (2007). <p>Oil and gas and mineral development BMPs would be used, including minimizing roadbed width and footprint size, co-location of facilities, etc., to minimize habitat fragmentation.</p> <p>The BLM would continue to use the lease notices that the BLM and USFWS agreed to (Appendix A).</p> <p>Inventories and monitoring studies would be conducted in order to determine special status plant and animal species locations, potential habitat, population dynamics, and existing and potential threats.</p> <p>The protection of species and potential and/or occupied habitat for special status species would be considered and implemented prior to any authorization or action by the BLM that could alter or disturb such habitat.</p> <p>No management action would be permitted on BLM lands that would jeopardize the continued existence of species that are listed, proposed for listing, or candidates for listing under the Endangered Species Act.</p> <p>The BLM would follow and implement the guidelines and management recommendations presented in species recovery or conservation plans (as updated), or alternative management strategies developed in consultation with USFWS.</p> <p>The BLM would support and implement where possible current and future sensitive species Conservation Agreements, including the Colorado River Cutthroat Trout Conservation Agreement and Strategy and Conservation Agreement for the roundtail chub, bluehead sucker, and flannelmouth sucker.</p> <p>The BLM would continue to work with USFWS and others to ensure that plans and agreements are updated to reflect the latest scientific data.</p> <p>The BLM would work cooperatively with USFWS and UDWR to obtain and/or maintain maps of current occupied and potential habitats for special status species.</p> <p>The BLM would work with the UDWR to implement the Utah Wildlife Action Plan (UDWR 2005) to coordinate management decisions that would conserve native species and prevent the need for additional listings.</p> <p>Translocations of population augmentation of special status species would be allowed to aid in conservation and recovery efforts. Necessary habitat manipulations and monitoring would be implemented to ensure successful translocation efforts.</p> <p>The BLM would implement and follow the guidelines in the Colorado River Fishes Recovery and Implementation Program (as updated).</p> <p>Implement the BLM's Guidance for the Management of Sagebrush Plant Communities for Sage-grouse Conservation and the BLM's National Sage-grouse Habitat Conservation Strategy.</p> <p>Consistent with RMP goals and objectives, the following plans or best available scientific information would be utilized and applied, as needed, as part of implementing the BLM's National Sage-grouse Habitat Conservation Strategy: Strategic Management Plan for Sage-grouse (BLM 2004d), WAFWA Conservation Assessment of Greater Sage-grouse and Sagebrush Habitats (Connelly et al. 2004), and the Gunnison Sage-grouse Rangewide Conservation Plan (2005, as revised).</p> <p>The Gunnison Sage-grouse Conservation Easement (320 acres) would be managed as outlined in the easement to protect and enhance habitat for sage-grouse. The easement is in perpetuity, even as ownership changes.</p> <p>Retain potential/occupied special status species habitat in federal ownership. Acquisition of potential/occupied special status species habitat would be high priority. These acquired/exchanged lands would be managed according to BLM land management prescriptions for special status species.</p> <p>Any nonessential routes developed for a project located in special status species habitat would be closed and rehabilitated when the project is complete.</p> <p>Raptor management would be guided by the use of Best Management Practices for Raptors and Their Associated Habitats in Utah (Appendix M), utilizing seasonal and spatial buffers, as well as mitigation, to maintain and enhance raptor nesting and foraging habitat, while allowing other resource uses.</p> <p>The BLM would implement and follow the Finalized Conservation Measures and Best Management Practices for Bald Eagle and Threatened and Endangered Species of Utah from the Land Use Plan Programmatic BAs and Section 7 Consultation (2007, as revised) (Appendix Q).</p> <p><u>Gunnison Prairie dogs</u></p> <p>Site-specific analysis would be conducted to determine presence or absence of prairie-dog colonies within potential/occupied habitat (Map 72). Colonies would be protected from surface-disturbing activities with the use of Best Management Practices, standard oil and gas lease terms (60 days/200 meters rule), Conditions of Approval, and Standard Operating Procedures. Site-specific analysis would mitigate impacts from other BLM-authorized activities.</p>					
Gunnison Sage-grouse					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Unspecified.	<u>Crucial Habitat:</u> 145,583 acres (BLM lands: 4,884 acres) The following prescriptions would apply to BLM lands and/or BLM-permitted activities associated with the administration of federal	<u>Crucial Year-round Habitat:</u> 145,583 acres (BLM lands: 4,884 acres) The following prescriptions would apply to BLM lands and/or BLM-permitted activities associated with	<u>Crucial Habitat:</u> 70,460 acres (BLM Lands: 3,197 acres) The following prescriptions would apply to BLM lands and/or BLM-permitted activities associated with the administration of federal	Same as Alternative B except that non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, as closed to OHV use, as ROW exclusion areas, as unavailable for	<u>Crucial Habitat:</u> 145,583 acres (BLM lands: 4,884 acres) The following prescriptions would apply to BLM lands and/or BLM-permitted activities associated with the administration of federal minerals on split-estate lands: <u>Lek habitat (within 0.6 miles of active strutting ground):</u>

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

	<p>minerals on split-estate lands: <u>Lek habitat (within 0.6 miles of active strutting ground):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Prohibit year-round construction of fences. Retrofit visual devices on existing fences to prevent collisions. Where opportunity exists, remove existing fences.• Prohibit construction of power lines or permanent aboveground structures year-round.• CSU for oil and gas leasing activities.• Unavailable for non-ground-disturbing geophysical work from March 20 to May 15.• Prohibit construction of roads year-round.• Prohibit construction of wind power turbines year-round.• Avoid all permitted activities from March 20 to May 15. If impracticable, no activity from sunset the evening before to 3 hours after sunrise the next morning.	<p>the administration of federal minerals on split-estate lands: <u>Lek habitat (within 0.6 miles of active strutting ground):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Retrofit visual devices on existing fences to prevent collisions year-round. Where opportunity exists, remove existing fences. Avoid construction of new fences. If new fences have to be built, fit with visual devices.• Prohibit construction of power lines or other tall structures year-round.• NSO for oil and gas leasing activities.• Unavailable for non-ground-disturbing geophysical work from March 11 to May 15.• Prohibit construction of roads year-round.• Avoid construction of wind power turbines year-round.• With the exception of grazing, prohibit all permitted activities from 1 hour before sunrise to 3 hours after sunrise from March 11 to May 15.	<p>minerals on split-estate lands: <u>Lek habitat (within 0.25 miles of active strutting ground):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Avoid construction of fences• Avoid construction of power lines or other tall structures. If impractical, bury power lines or retrofit them to prevent perching by raptors.• CSU for oil and gas leasing activities.• Unavailable for non-ground-disturbing geophysical work from March 20 to May 15.• Prohibit maintenance and operation activities for mineral production from 1 hour before sunrise to 3 hours after sunrise from March 20 to May 15.• Prohibit construction of roads year-round.• Avoid construction of wind power turbines year-round.• Avoid permitted activities from 1 hour before sunrise to 3 hours after sunrise from March 20 to May 15.	<p>disposal of mineral materials, as unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, as VRM Class I, and proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Prohibit year-round construction of fences. Retrofit visual devices on existing fences to prevent collisions. Where opportunity exists, remove existing fences.• Prohibit construction of power lines or permanent aboveground structures year-round.• NSO for oil and gas leasing activities.• Unavailable for non-ground-disturbing geophysical work from March 20 to May 15.• Prohibit construction of roads year-round.• Prohibit construction of wind power turbines year-round.• Avoid all permitted activities from March 20 to May 15. If impracticable, no activity from sunset the evening before to 3 hours after sunrise the next morning.
Unspecified.	<p><u>Year-round habitat (within 6 miles of active strutting ground May 16–March 19):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sagebrush treatments must have recovery objectives that meet the habitat objectives listed in the Gunnison Sage-grouse Rangewide Conservation Plan (2005, as amended). Any variance from these recovery objectives would be subject to site-specific NEPA, including collaboration with stakeholder groups.• Prohibit the construction of new fences. If impracticable, increase the visibility of the fences (flagging, white-tipped T-posts, etc.) and monitor effectiveness of visual devices and modify or remove feces if necessary to minimize sage-grouse mortality.• Leasing would be available with standard stipulations for oil and gas development Follow Suggested Management Practices, where applicable, for	<p><u>Year-round habitat (within 6 miles of active strutting ground June 1–March 14):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sagebrush treatments must have recovery objectives that meet the habitat objectives listed in the Gunnison Sage-grouse Rangewide Conservation Plan (2005, as amended). Any variance from these recovery objectives would be subject to site-specific NEPA, including collaboration with stakeholder groups.• Avoid the construction of new fences. If impracticable, increase the visibility of the fences (flagging, white-tipped T-post, etc.) and monitor effectiveness of visual devices and modify or remove feces if necessary to minimize sage-grouse mortality.• Leasing would be available with standard stipulations for oil and gas development. Follow Suggested Management Practices, where applicable for oil	<p><u>Year-round habitat (within 6 miles of active strutting ground May 16–March 19):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sagebrush treatments must have recovery objectives that meet the habitat objectives listed in the Gunnison Sage-grouse Rangewide Conservation Plan (2005, as amended), or, if varied, must be approved by local sage-grouse working group.• Construction of new fences must be made as visible as possible (flagging, white-tipped T-posts, etc.) to avoid grouse collisions.• Leasing would be available with standard stipulations for oil and gas development.• Manage grazing to maintain Rangeland Health.• The following grazing allotment would not be grazed from March 20 to May 15: Sage Flat, Upper East Canyon, Sage-grouse, and Dry Farm.	<p>Same as Alternative B except that non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, as closed to OHV use, as ROW exclusion areas, as unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, as unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, as VRM Class I, and proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.</p>	<p><u>Year-round habitat (within 4 miles of active strutting ground May 16–March 19):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sagebrush treatments must have recovery objectives that meet the habitat objectives listed in the Gunnison Sage-grouse Rangewide Conservation Plan (2005, as amended). Any variance from these recovery objectives would be subject to site-specific NEPA, including collaboration with stakeholder groups.• Avoid construction of new fences. If impracticable, increase the visibility of the fences (flagging, white-tipped T-posts, etc.) and monitor effectiveness of visual devices and modify or remove feces if necessary to minimize sage-grouse mortality.• Leasing would be available with standard stipulations for oil and gas development Follow Suggested Management Practices, where applicable, for oil and gas development listed in the Gunnison Sage-grouse Rangewide Conservation Plan (2005, as amended).• Avoid the construction of power lines, wind power turbines, or other aboveground structures. If impractical, bury power lines or retrofit them to prevent perching by raptors. Follow Suggested Management Practices for wind power turbines or other aboveground structures as listed in the Gunnison Sage-grouse Rangewide Conservation Plan (2005, as amended).• Limit grazing use levels as necessary to maintain and/or improve sage-grouse habitat. <p>The following grazing allotments would not be grazed from</p>

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

	<p>oil and gas development listed in the Gunnison Sage-grouse Rangewide Conservation Plan (2005, as amended).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Prohibit the construction of power lines, wind power turbines, or other aboveground structures.Limit grazing use levels as necessary to maintain and/or improve sage-grouse habitat.The following grazing allotments would not be grazed from March 20 to May 15: Sage Flat, Upper East Canyon, Sage-grouse, and Dry Farm.	<p>and gas development listed in the Gunnison Sage-grouse Rangewide Conservation Plan (2005, as amended).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Avoid the construction of power lines or other aboveground structures. If impractical, bury power lines or retrofit them to prevent perching by raptors.Prohibit construction of wind power turbines.Limit grazing use levels as necessary to maintain and/or improve sage-grouse habitat.The following grazing allotments would not be grazed from March 20 to May 15: Sage Flat, Upper East Canyon, Sage-grouse, and Dry Farm.			<p>March 20 to May 15: Sage Flat, Upper East Canyon, Sage-grouse, and Dry Farm.</p>
Habitat for Mexican Spotted Owl and Flannelmouth Sucker (Arch Canyon)					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
<p>OHV limited to designate route in canyon.</p> <p>Open to motorized use to USFS boundary (8 miles).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Closed to OHV use.Group size (for nonmechanized, nonmotorized) limited to 10 individuals and 2 groups per day.A permit system would be implemented.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">OHV use would be limited to the designated route to the end of the State Section (T37S R20E Section 16) year-round (approximately 3.8 miles). The canyon would be closed year-round from west boundary of the state section to the end of the route at the National Forest boundary.Group size limited to 12 vehicles and two groups per day.A permit system would be implemented.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">OHV use limited to the designated route year-round.Commercial motorized use limited to 12 vehicles and up to 2 trips a day.Private OHV group size would be unlimited.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Area would be closed to OHV use.Group size (for nonmechanized, nonmotorized) would be limited to 10 individuals and two groups per day.A permit system would be implemented.	<p>Note: <i>In Arch Canyon, OHV use would be limited to the designated route up to the national forest boundary, a total of 8 miles one way. Organized and commercial groups would be required to obtain a Special Recreation Use Permit. This permit would allow access on the designated route up to the National Forest boundary except from March 1 through August 31. During this period, access would be limited to 7.5 miles of the designated route. Therefore, during this period motorized access would not be allowed within 0.5 miles of the National Forest boundary.</i>⁷</p>
TRAVEL MANAGEMENT					
<p>GOALS AND OBJECTIVES</p> <p>The BLM would provide opportunities for a range of motorized recreation experiences on public lands while protecting resources and minimizing conflicts among various users.</p> <p>All BLM lands would be designated as open, limited, or closed. Seasonal restrictions can be applied to the limited category.</p> <p>Any fire, military, emergency, or law enforcement vehicle being used for emergency or administrative purposes is exempt from OHV decisions.</p> <p>OHV vehicle use would be managed in accordance with the BLM's National OHV strategy.</p>					
<p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ALTERNATIVES</p> <p>Through future implementation level planning, designated routes would be categorized as mechanized only (bicycles), single-track motorized (dirt bikes), or two-track motorized (four-wheelers, jeeps), or available to all vehicles, or any combination of these categories. Adjustments of these categories would be made based on recreational demand and potential conflict. All nonmotorized travel would be allowed on designated routes unless otherwise prohibited.</p> <p>Mechanized travel (bicycles) would be limited to designated roads and trails.</p> <p>There would be no exceptions that allow for cross-country travel for game retrieval or antler gathering in areas designated as limited or closed. OHV use for game retrieval would adhere to all OHV classifications in all alternatives.</p>					

⁷ This is an implementation-level decision that cannot be protested under the planning regulations. Please see the cover letter for further information.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

<p>BLM Back Country Byways and National Recreation Trails may be designated in the future, as deemed appropriate, with site-specific environmental analysis.</p> <p>Appendix N outlines the processes and procedures for making modifications to the travel plan designated route network.</p> <p>The BLM, in preparing its RMP designations and its implementation-level travel management plans, is following policy and regulation authority found at: 43 C.F.R. Part 8340; 43 C.F.R. Subpart 8364; and 43 C.F.R. Subpart 9268.</p> <p>Where the authorized officer determines that OHVs are causing or would cause considerable adverse impacts, the authorized officer shall close or restrict such areas. The public would be notified. The BLM could impose limitations on types of vehicles allowed on specific designated routes if monitoring indicates that a particular type of vehicle is causing disturbance to the soil, wildlife habitat, cultural or vegetative resources, especially by off-road travel in an area that is limited to designated routes.</p> <p>Where routes would remain available for motorized use within WSAs, such use could continue on a conditional basis. Use of the existing routes in the WSAs ("ways" when located within WSAs—see Glossary) could continue as long as the use of these routes does not impair wilderness suitability, as provided by the IMP (BLM 1995). If Congress designates the area as wilderness, the routes will be closed. In the interim, if use and/or noncompliance are found through monitoring efforts to impair the area's suitability for wilderness designation, the BLM would take further action to limit use of the routes, or close them. The continued use of these routes, therefore, is based on user compliance and nonimpairment of wilderness values.</p>					
OHV Area Designations					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
<p>Open to OHV use: 611,310 acres (Map 58)</p> <p>Squaw Canyon and Cross Canyon WSAs are within this acreage but would not be open for OHV use unless and until Congress releases them from WSA status. This would require a plan amendment.</p>	<p>Open to OHV use: 0 acres (Map 59)</p>	<p>Open to OHV use: 2,311 acres (Map 60)</p>	<p>Open to OHV use: 2,311 acres (Map 61)</p>	<p>Open to OHV use: 0 acres (Map 62)</p>	<p>Open to OHV use: 0 acres</p>
<p>Limited use with seasonal restrictions: 540,260 acres</p> <p>To protect the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• bighorn sheep lambing and rutting areas• antelope fawning areas• deer winter ranges <p>Limited to existing roads and trails: 570,390 acres</p> <p>To protect cultural, scenic, and recreational values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Alkali Ridge ACEC• Scenic Highway Corridor ACEC• Most SPNM-class areas <p>Limited to Designated Roads and Trails: 218,780 acres</p> <p>To protect cultural, scenic, and recreational values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cedar Mesa ACEC (partial)• Hovenweep ACEC• Pearson Canyon hiking area• Shay Canyon ACEC• SPNM-class areas in SRMAs• Road corridors adjacent to SPNM-class areas• Developed recreation sites• Floodplains, riparian/aquatic	<p>Limited to designated routes: 1,359,417 acres</p> <p>Mountain bike use would be limited to the same designated routes as OHV travel.</p>	<p>Limited to designated routes: 1,362,142 acres (Map 60)</p> <p>Mountain bike use would be limited to the same designated routes as OHV travel.</p>	<p>Limited to designated routes: 1,780,807 acres (Map 61)</p> <p>Mountain bike use would be limited to the same designated routes as OHV travel.</p>	<p>Limited to designated routes: 812,679 acres (Map 62)</p> <p>Mountain bike use would be limited to the same designated routes as OHV travel.</p>	<p>* Limited to designated routes: 1,388,191 acres (Maps 63 and 64):</p> <p><i>Mountain bike use would be limited to the same designated routes as OHV travel.⁸</i></p>

⁸ This is an implementation-level decision that cannot be protested under the planning regulations. Please see the cover letter for further information.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

areas					
<p>Closed to OHV Use: 276,430 acres</p> <p>To protect the following vegetation study areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Bridger Jack Mesa ACEC• Lavender Mesa ACEC <p>To protect the following cultural, scenic, and recreational values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Butler Wash ACEC• Cedar Mesa ACEC (partial)• Dark Canyon ACEC• Indian Creek ACEC• Most ROS-P areas• San Juan River SRMA SPM-class area• RN-class area on Mancos Mesa <p>Note: Acres may not be additive because of overlap.</p>	<p>Closed to OHV Use: 423,698 acres</p> <p>To protect the following vegetation study areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Bridger Jack Mesa ACEC• Lavender Mesa ACEC <p>To protect the following cultural, scenic, and recreational values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• San Juan River SRMA SPM-class area <p>To protect the following cultural values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Tank Bench SRMA, Outlaw Canyon• Tank Bench SRMA, South Cottonwood Wash <p>To protect the wilderness character of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cross Canyon WSA• Squaw and Papoose WSA• Mule Canyon WSA• Fish Creek WSA• Grand Gulch ISA Complex• Road Canyon WSA• Dark Canyon WSA• Indian Creek WSA• Bridger Jack Mesa WSA• Butler Wash WSA• Mancos Mesa WSA• Cheesebox Canyon WSA• South Needles WSA and the Administratively Endorsed Lands that are contiguous to Butler Wash WSA.	<p>Closed to OHV Use: 418,667 acres (Map 60):</p> <p>To protect the following vegetation study areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Bridger Jack Mesa WSA• Lavender Mesa ACEC <p>To protect the following cultural, scenic, and recreational values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A portion of the San Juan River SRMA (partial) <p>To protect the following cultural values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Tank Bench SRMA, Outlaw Canyon• Tank Bench SRMA, South Cottonwood Wash <p>To protect wilderness character of the WSAs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cross Canyon WSA• Squaw and Papoose WSA• Mule Canyon WSA• Fish Creek WSA• Grand Gulch WSA ISA Complex• Road Canyon WSA• Dark Canyon WSA• Indian Creek WSA• Bridger Jack Mesa WSA• Butler Wash WSA• Mancos Mesa WSA• Cheesebox Canyon WSA• South Needles WSA and the Administratively Endorsed Lands that are contiguous to Butler Wash WSA. <p>Four WSAs would allow for temporary, conditional motorized use of 7 ways to provide access to trailheads:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fish Creek WSA 2 ways• Road Canyon WSA 1 way• Mancos Mesa WSA 2 ways• Grand Gulch WSA 2 ways• Trailheads would be relocated outside of the WSAs and the	<p>Closed to OHV Use: 0 acres (Map 61)</p>	<p>Closed to OHV Use: 970,436 acres (Map 62)</p> <p>To protect vegetation study areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Bridger Jack Mesa ACEC• Lavender Mesa ACEC <p>To protect cultural, scenic, and recreational values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• San Juan River SRMA SPM-class area <p>To protect cultural values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Tank Bench SRMA, Outlaw Canyon• Tank Bench SRMA, South Cottonwood Wash <p>To protect wilderness character:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cross Canyon WSA• Squaw and Papoose WSA• Mule Canyon WSA• Fish Creek WSA• Grand Gulch WSA ISA Complex• Road Canyon WSA• Dark Canyon WSA• Indian Creek WSA• Bridger Jack Mesa WSA• Butler Wash WSA• Mancos Mesa WSA• Cheesebox Canyon WSA• South Needles WSA and the Administratively Endorsed Lands that are contiguous to Butler Wash WSA• Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics as shown on Map 33.	<p>Closed to OHV Use: 393,895 acres (Maps 63 and 64).</p> <p>To protect the following vegetation study areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Bridger Jack Mesa WSA• Lavender Mesa ACEC <p>To protect the following scenic values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Indian Creek ACEC <p>To protect the following cultural, scenic, and recreational values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A portion of the San Juan River SRMA <p>To protect the following cultural values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Tank Bench SRMA, Outlaw Canyon• Tank Bench SRMA, South Cottonwood Wash <p>To protect the wilderness character of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cross Canyon WSA• Squaw and Papoose WSA• Mule Canyon WSA• Fish Creek WSA• Grand Gulch WSA ISA Complex• Road Canyon WSA• Dark Canyon WSA• Indian Creek WSA• Bridger Jack Mesa WSA• Butler Wash WSA• Mancos Mesa WSA• Cheesebox Canyon WSA• South Needles WSA and the Administratively Endorsed Lands that are contiguous to Butler Wash WSA. <p>Note: Three WSAs (Fish Creek, Road Canyon, and Grand Gulch) would allow for temporary, conditional motorized use of several ways (four or fewer) to provide recreational access to existing trailheads. Trailheads would be relocated outside of the WSAs and the ways rehabilitated at a future date⁹.</p>

⁹ This is an implementation-level decision that cannot be protested under the planning regulations. Please see the cover letter for further information.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

		ways rehabilitated at a future date.			
Miles of Designated Roads on Public Lands within the Monticello PA					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Open B-Class Roads: 890 miles Open D-Class Roads: 2,179 miles Closed D-Class Roads: 0 miles	Open B-Class Roads: 875 miles Open D-Class Roads: 1,521 miles Closed D-Class Roads: 780 miles	Open B-Class Roads: 873 miles Open D-Class Roads: 1,947 miles Closed D-Class Roads: 316 miles	Open B-Class Roads: 873 miles Open D-Class Roads: 2,205 miles Closed D-Class Roads: 45 miles	Open B-Class Roads: 875 miles Open D-Class Roads: 1,342 miles Closed D-Class Roads: 959 miles	Open B-Class Roads: 873 miles <i>*Open D-Class Roads: 1,947 miles¹⁰</i> <i>*Closed D-Class Roads: 316 miles¹¹</i>
Special Stipulation Areas within the <i>Limited to Designated Routes</i> Category					
Arch Canyon (to protect wildlife)					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Area open to OHV use. Seasonal stipulations March 1–August 31 for Mexican Spotted Owl.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Area would be closed to OHV use.Group size (for nonmechanized, nonmotorized) limited to 10 individuals and two groups per day.A permit system would be implemented.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">OHV use would be limited to the designated route to the end of the State Section (T37S R20E Section 16) year-round (approximately 3.8 miles). The canyon would be closed year-round from west boundary of the state section to the end of the route at the National Forest boundary.Group size limited to 12 vehicles and two groups per day.There would be no limits on nonmechanized, nonmotorized group size.A permit system would be implemented.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">OHV use would be limited to designated route year-round.Commercial motorized use would be limited to 12 people per trip and up to 2 trips per day.Private OHV group size would be unlimited.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Area would be closed to OHV use.Group size (for nonmechanized, nonmotorized) would be limited to 10 individuals and two groups per day.A permit system would be implemented.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">*OHV use would be limited to the designated route up to the USFS boundary year-round, at total of 8 miles one way.¹²*Organized and commercial groups are required to obtain a Special Recreation Use Permit. This permit would allow access on the designated route up to the *National Forest boundary except March 1–August 31. During this period, access would be 7.5 miles of the designated route. Motorized access would not be allowed within 0.5 miles of the national forest boundary.¹³
McLoyd Canyon–Moon House (for Cultural Protection)					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
See also Cultural section.	The "way" D4798, which is within Fish Creek WSA, would be closed to motorized use.	No motorized travel would be allowed on northern section of road (approximately 500 feet) D4798, which crosses onto BLM land (and lies within Fish Creek WSA) at the northern State Section boundary.	Travel would be allowed on Road D4798 and would be limited to the designated route (which lies within the Fish Creek WSA).	The "way" D4798, which is within Fish Creek WSA, would be closed to motorized use.	No motorized travel would be allowed on northern section of road (approximately 500 feet) D4798, which crosses onto BLM land (and lies within Fish Creek WSA) at the northern State Section boundary.
Nonmechanized (e.g., Hiking, Equestrian, and Backpacking)					
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ALTERNATIVES Nonmechanized travel is not restricted on public lands except where limited or prohibited to protect specific resource values, provide for public safety, or maintain an identified opportunity. Provide opportunities for nonmechanized travel (hiking) on all routes open to mechanized use. Manage routes identified in each alternative to exclude motorized and mechanized use and provide opportunities for nonmechanized travel independent of motorized and mechanized routes.					

¹⁰ This is an implementation-level decision that cannot be protested under the planning regulations. Please see the cover letter for further information

¹¹ This is an implementation-level decision that cannot be protested under the planning regulations. Please see the cover letter for further information.

¹² This is an implementation-level decision that cannot be protested under the planning regulations. Please see the cover letter for further information

¹³ This is an implementation-level decision that cannot be protested under the planning regulations. Please see the cover letter for further information.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

<p>Limit nonmechanized travel on specific lands to designated routes for resource protection purposes.</p> <p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ACTION ALTERNATIVES</p> <p>Manage the following trails for nonmechanized use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Open to foot travel: Kane Gulch, Todie Canyon, Bullet Canyon, Shieks Canyon, Government Trail, Collins Canyon, Slickhorn Canyon, Point Lookout Canyon, Grand Gulch (from junction to San Juan River), Fish Canyon, Owl Canyon, Road Canyon, McLoyd Canyon, Lime Creek Canyon, North Mule Canyon, South Mule Canyon, Lower Mule Canyon from Comb Wash, Mule Canyon or Cave Canyon Towers, Arch Canyon, Johns Canyon, Honaker Trail, Keeley Trail, Dark Canyon (Sundance Trail), Fable Valley Trail, Salt Creek Mesa Trail, Butler Ruin Interpretative Trail, Sand Island Petroglyph Trail, Shay Canyon Petroglyph Trail, Newspaper Rock Trail, Salvation Knoll Trail, Monarch Cave Trail, Fish Mouth Trail, Cold Springs Trail, Procession Panel Trail, Wolf Man Panel Trail, Moon House Trail, Ball Room Cave Trail.● Open for Stock overnight use: Kane Gulch, Government Trail, Collins Canyon, Grand Gulch (from Kane Gulch to the junction of Collins Canyon; no stock below Collins Canyon), Fish Canyon (from Comb Wash to confluence with Owl Canyon), Road Canyon, Lime Creek Canyon, Lower Mule Canyon from Comb Wash, Arch Canyon, Johns Canyon, Salt Creek Mesa Trail.● Open for stock day use: Bullet Canyon (from Grand Gulch to Jailhouse Ruin), Fish Canyon (2 miles above the confluence with Owl Canyon), Owl Canyon (to Neville's Arch), Road Canyon, McLoyd Canyon (to the impassible pour-off), Lime Creek Canyon, Salt Creek Mesa Trail, Monarch Cave Trail, Fish Mouth Trail, Cold Springs Trail, Procession Panel Trail, Wolf Man Panel Trail. <p>Nonmechanized routes may be added through subsequent planning at the activity plan level on a case by case basis.</p> <p>Indian Creek Climbing Trails would include the following: Bridger Jack Mesa, Super Crack Buttress, Cat Wall, Broken Tooth Wall, Scarface, and Battle of the Bulge.</p>
<p>VEGETATION</p>
<p>GOALS AND OBJECTIVES</p> <p>Manage vegetation resources for desired future conditions, as determined by site-specific BLM objectives and rangeland functionality and health, thereby ensuring ecological diversity, stability, and sustainability, including the desired mix of vegetation types, structural stages, and landscape/riparian/watershed function, and provide for native plant, fish, and wildlife habitats.</p> <p>Provide sustainable forage for livestock and wildlife with a plant community that incorporates and meets the standards for rangeland health.</p> <p>Provide opportunities for plant material gathering (seed collection, plant collection, etc.) of various vegetation types while protecting other resources.</p> <p>Maintain existing vegetative treatment areas as appropriate.</p> <p>Sustain the integrity of the sagebrush steppe community type to provide the amount, continuity, and quality of habitat that is necessary to maintain sustainable populations of sage-grouse and other sagebrush obligate species.</p> <p>Control invasive and non-native weed species and prevent the introduction of new invasive species through the implementation of a comprehensive weed program, including coordination with partners; prevention and early detection; education; inventory and monitoring; and principles of integrated weed management.</p> <p>Control invasive and non-native weed species and prevent the introduction of new invasive species through the implementation of the BLM National Strategy and Action Plan as outlined in documents such as, "Pulling Together: National Strategy for Invasive Plant Management Initiative" and "Partners Against Weeds" (1994).</p> <p>Control insect pest species as necessary to protect vegetation resources in conjunction with Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS).</p>
<p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ALTERNATIVES</p> <p>Areas that meet Utah's Rangeland Health Standards would be open to seed gathering and plant collection, including commercial seed gathering.</p> <p>Seed gathering would be managed according to Utah BLM guidance for Seed Collection Policy and Pricing (as amended).</p> <p>1.3.1 Guidance for Addressing Sagebrush Habitat Conservation (November, 2004) as described in the BLM's National Sage-grouse Habitat Conservation Strategy (WO-IM-2005-024) would be implemented.</p> <p>Necessary vegetation information would be gathered and monitoring continued to assess if planning objectives are being met.</p> <p>Invasive and non-native weed species (as identified in Table 3.59, Invasive and Noxious Weeds of San Juan County) would be controlled, and the infestation and spread of new invasive species prevented through cooperative agreements, implementing the principles in BLM weed management policies and action plans.</p> <p>Poisonous plant species would be controlled as necessary based on site-specific needs.</p> <p>Cooperating agreements with other federal, state, local, and private organizations would be developed to control invasive non-native species, control insect pest species, and implement fuels vegetation treatments and WUI risk assessments and management.</p> <p>Prevention measures (SOPs and mitigation measures) from the 2007 ROD Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides on Bureau of Land Management Lands in 17 Western States PEIS (and associated document] would be incorporated. Those BMPs are located in Appendix B and mitigation measures in Table 2 of that ROD.</p> <p>Upland areas would be managed to achieve DFC.</p> <p>Unnecessary social footpath trails would be minimized throughout the PA.</p> <p>Pack stock and riding stock users on BLM-administered land would be required to use certified weed-free feed.</p> <p>Restoration/rehabilitation activities would be required to use certified weed-free seed mixes, mulch, fill, etc.</p> <p>The power washing of equipment used for permitted uses may be required to help control noxious weeds.</p> <p>Continue implementation of noxious weed and invasive species control actions as per national guidance and local weed management plans in cooperation with state, federal, affected counties, adjoining private land owners and other partners or interests directly affected.</p> <p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ACTION ALTERNATIVES</p> <p>Implement 30,000 to 50,000 acres of vegetation treatments in Fire Regime Condition Class III areas over a 15-year period.</p> <p>The following sagebrush communities would be prioritized for treatment: Harts Draw, Beef Basin, Black Mesa, Alkali, Mustang, Cedar Point, Shay Mesa, and all areas with Gunnison Sage-grouse habitat.</p> <p>Treat greasewood in Comb Wash, Butler Wash, Montezuma, East Canyon, Indian Creek, South and North Cottonwood Wash, and Cross Canyon to improve ground cover, biodiversity, and water quality.</p>

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Maintain existing land treatments and provide new land treatments; apply RMP stipulations and special conditions through NEPA documentation (232,130 acres).	Maintain an estimated 1,000 acres/year of existing land treatments and implement new vegetation treatments to restore ecosystem health, functioning condition, etc. in the following vegetation cover types: <ul style="list-style-type: none">sagebrush 1,000 acres/yearweed treatments 3,000 acres/yearpinyon-juniper 2,000 acres/yearriparian 500 acres/yeargreasewood 100 acres/year	Maintain an estimated 1,500 acres/year of existing land treatments and implement new vegetation treatments to restore ecosystem health, functioning condition, etc. in the following vegetation cover types: <ul style="list-style-type: none">sagebrush 1,500 acres/yearweed treatments 3,000 acres/yearpinyon-juniper 3,000 acres/yearriparian 100 acres/yeargreasewood 200 acres/year	Maintain an estimated 2,000 acres/year of existing land treatments and implement new vegetation treatments to restore ecosystem health, functioning condition, etc. in the following vegetation cover types: <ul style="list-style-type: none">sagebrush 2,000 acres/yearweed treatments 3,000 acres/yearpinyon-juniper 4,000 acres/yearriparian 100 acres/yeargreasewood 200 acres/year	Same as Alternative B except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, closed to OHV use, proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry, ROW exclusion area, unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, unavailable for land treatments, and managed as VRM Class I, Land treatments would be maintained with non–surface-disturbing techniques.	Maintain an estimated 1,500 acres/year of existing land treatments and implement new vegetation treatments to restore ecosystem health, functioning condition, etc. in the following vegetation cover types: <ul style="list-style-type: none">sagebrush 1,500 acres/yearweed treatments 3,000 acres/yearpinyon-juniper 3,000 acres/yearriparian 100 acres/yeargreasewood 200 acres/year
VISUAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT (VRM)					
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES Designate VRM classes. Manage activities consistent with VRM management class objectives. MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ALTERNATIVES All permitted activities would have to comply with VRM management class objectives, unless a waiver, exemption, or modification is granted by the Authorized Officer. WSAs would be managed as VRM Class I. Allow for recreational viewing platforms and special recreation facilities in all high scenic areas. VRM classifications need to match Minimum Impact Criteria. MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ACTION ALTERNATIVES Visual resources would be managed as the VRM inventory class (see Maps 66–71) unless specified otherwise in the management prescriptions. In areas available for oil and gas leasing subject to standard lease terms or available to oil and gas leasing subject to Timing and CSU, visual resources would be managed as VRM Class III or IV (depending on inventory) unless otherwise specified in the management prescriptions. Areas that inventory as VRM Class II but are in areas that are available for oil and gas leasing subject to standard lease terms or available to oil and gas leasing subject to Timing and Controlled Surface Use would be managed as VRM Class III unless otherwise specified in the management prescriptions below. Wild segments of a WSR would be managed as VRM Class I. Scenic segments of a WSR would be managed as VRM Class II. Recreation segments of a WSR would be managed as the same VRM class as surrounding land. Visual Impact analysis would use GIS technology.					
(Lists below are not meant to be inclusive. See Maps 66–71)					
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
371,575 acres would be managed as VRM Class I (Map 66). <ul style="list-style-type: none">The Monticello FO manages 13 WSAs (389,440 acres): Mancos Mesa (51,440 acres), Grand Gulch ISA Complex (37,810), Road Canyon (52,420), Fish Creek Canyon (46,440), Mule Canyon (5,990), Cheesebox Canyon (15,410), Dark Canyon ISA Complex (62,040), Butler Wash (22,030), Bridger Jack Mesa (5,290), Indian Creek (6,870), South Needles (160),	497,668 acres would be managed as VRM Class I (Map 67). WSAs (same as Alternative A). Potential ACECs: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Butler Wash NorthDark CanyonLockhart BasinValley of the GodsIndian CreekSan Juan River Sections 3 and 5 WSRs:	425,179 acres would be managed as VRM Class I (Map 68). WSAs (same as Alternative A). Potential ACECs: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Valley of the GodsIndian CreekSan Juan River Sections 3 and 5 WSRs: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Dark Canyon WSRColorado River Number 3	390,424 acres would be managed as VRM Class I (Map 69). WSAs (same as Alternative A).	998,370 acres would be managed as VRM Class I (Map 70). WSAs (same as Alternative A). Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics: (Total acres 582,360), Arch Canyon (50), Bridger Jack Mesa (23050), Butler Wash (1660), Cheesebox Canyon (13240), Comb Ridge (13,760), Cross Canyon (1350), Dark Canyon (66330), Fish and Owl Creeks (24650), Fort Knocker Canyon (12410), Gooseneck (3570), Grand Gulch (55240), Gravel and	422,989 acres would be managed as VRM Class I (Map 71). 13 WSAs (389,440 acres): Mancos Mesa (51,440 acres), Grand Gulch ISA Complex (37,810), Road Canyon (52,420), Fish Creek Canyon (46,440), Mule Canyon (5,990), Cheesebox Canyon (15,410), Dark Canyon ISA Complex (62,040), Butler Wash (22,030), Bridger Jack Mesa (5,290), Indian Creek (6,870), South Needles (160), Squaw and Papoose Canyons (6,560), Cross Canyon (1,008), and the Butler Wash lands administratively endorsed for wilderness. Potential ACECs: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Valley of the GodsIndian CreekSan Juan River Section 3

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

<p>Squaw and Papoose Canyons (6,560), Cross Canyon (1,008).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Castle Creek, Horse Pasture, and Steer Pasture• Moqui Canyon; south end of Mancos Mesa• Scenic Highway Corridor ACEC to the intersection with Natural Bridges	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Dark Canyon Suitable River Segment• Colorado Number 3• San Juan River Suitable Sections 3 and 5• Fable Valley Suitable River Segment			<p>Long Canyons (36890), Hammond Canyon (4700), Harmony Flat (9660), Harts Point (24740), Hatch Lockhart (1760), Indian Creek (23260), Lime Creek (5560), Mancos Mesa (61570), Nokai Dome (94270), Red Rock Plateau (17010), Road Canyon (11320), San Juan River (14340), Shay Mountain (6710), Sheep Canyon (4000), Squaw and Papoose Canyon (3570), Upper Red Canyon (24920), Valley of the Gods (13670), White Canyon (9080)</p>	<p>WSRs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Dark Canyon Suitable River Segment• Colorado River Suitable Segment 3• San Juan River Suitable Segment 5
<p>355,112 acres would be managed as VRM Class II including but not limited to the following (Map 66):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sweet Alice South/Ruin Canyon• North of Highway 95 in the Comb Ridge Area• South Cottonwood, east of Black Mesa Road• Clay Hill's Crossing (west end to state land) and the southern polygon (as shown on Map 66)• Highway 276 National Bridges area east, and southwest of UT 95 and 261 junction• Mesa shoulders for Tables of the Sun	<p>250,641 acres would be managed as VRM Class II including but not limited to the following (Map 67):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Castle Creek, Horse Pasture, and Steer Pasture <p>Potential ACECs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Bridger Jack Mesa• Lavender Mesa• Shay Canyon• San Juan River Section 1• Colorado River Segment 2 <p>WSRs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Colorado Segment 2• Fable Valley	<p>132,001 acres would be managed as VRM Class II including but not limited to the following (Map 68):</p> <p>Potential ACECs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lavender Mesa• Shay Canyon• San Juan River (portions) <p>WSRs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Colorado River Number 2• Southern boundary of Indian Creek east to rims is the northern boundary, and the southern boundary is the USFS northern boundary. On the east, the canyon rims then west to Highway 211.• Castle Creek, Horse Pasture, and Steer Pasture• Old Scenic Highway Corridor ACEC (from west to east) to the intersection with Natural Bridges.• Comb Ridge south of Highway 95, except for proposed campgrounds and Butler Wash OHV area• Highway 276 to Clay Hills Crossing (as shown on Map 68)• Mesa tops for Tables of the Sun	<p>8,838 acres would be managed same as VRM Class II, including but not limited to portions of the San Juan River (Map 69).</p>	<p>111,478 acres would be managed same as VRM Class II including but not limited to Castle Creek, Horse Pasture, and Steer Pasture (Map 70).</p> <p>Potential ACECs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Bridger Jack Mesa• Lavender Mesa• Shay Canyon• San Juan River Section 1• Colorado River Number 2 <p>WSRs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Colorado Number 2• Fable Valley	<p>228,041 acres would be managed as VRM Class II including but not limited to the following (Map 71):</p> <p>Potential ACECs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lavender Mesa• Shay Canyon• San Juan River (portions)• Hovenweep Visual Emphasis Zone <p>WSRs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Colorado River Suitable Segment 2• Mesa tops for Tables of the Sun• Comb Ridge Management Zone of Cedar Mesa SRMA• Indian Creek SRMA from Indian Creek ACEC south to USFS boundary and Davis and Lavender Canyons• Harmony Flat• White Canyon area• Dripping Canyon/Chicken Corners area• Non-WSA areas with wilderness characteristics (Dark Canyon, Mancos Mesa, Grand Gulch, Nokai Dome East and Nokai Dome West)
<p>416,806 acres would be managed as VRM Class III including but not limited to the following (Map 66):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Southern boundary of Indian Creek east to rims is the northern boundary, and the southern boundary is the USFS northern boundary. On the east the canyon rims then west to Highway 211.• Arch Canyon	<p>426,350 acres would be managed as VRM Class III including but not limited to the following (Map 67):</p> <p>Potential ACECs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Alkali Ridge• Cedar Mesa (outside of WSAs)• Hovenweep• San Juan River Sections 2 and 4 <p>WSRs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Colorado River Section 1	<p>531,920 acres would be managed as VRM Class III including but not limited to the following (Map 68):</p> <p>Potential ACECs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Hovenweep• San Juan River Sections 2 and 4• Cedar Mesa (SRMA) portions• Lockhart Basin• Sweet Alice South/Ruin Canyon• Moqui Canyon	<p>692,741 acres would be managed as VRM Class III including but not limited to the following (Map 69):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Castle Creek, Horse Pasture, Steer Pasture• Sweet Alice South/Ruin Canyon• Moqui Canyon, south end of Mancos Mesa• North of Highway 95 in the Comb Ridge area• South Cottonwood, east of Black	<p>264,369 acres would be managed as VRM Class III including but not limited to the following (Map 70):</p> <p>Potential ACECs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Alkali Ridge• Cedar Mesa (outside of WSAs)• Hovenweep• San Juan River Sections 2 and 4 <p>WSRs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Colorado River Number 1.	<p>507,583 acres would be managed as VRM Class III including but not limited to the following (Map 71):</p> <p>Potential ACECs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Hovenweep (outside of Visual Emphasis Zone)• Alkali Ridge• San Juan River Sections 2 and 4 <p>Other Areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cedar Mesa SRMA (portions)• Lockhart Basin• Sweet Alice South/Ruin Canyon

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Indian CreekArch CanyonSan Juan River Sections 1, 2, and 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Bridger Jack Mesa from mesa top to ATV trails/roads on west, north, and sides, and on the east to the private land boundary.Shay Canyon (119 acres) and areas for proposed campgrounds, parking lots, and associated facilitiesNorth of Highway 95 in the Comb Ridge AreaSouth Cottonwood east of Black Mesa RoadClay Hill's Crossing (west end to state land), and the southern polygon (as shown on Map 68) southwest of D2621 and D3514Highway 276 National Bridges area east, and southwest of UT 95 and 261 junctionPortions of Cedar Mesa areaTables of the Sun-shoulders of the mesa	<p>Mesa Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Clay Hill's Crossing (west end to state land) and the southern polygon (as shown on Map 69).Highway 276 National Bridges area east, and southwest of UT 95 and 261 junction.Shoulders of the mesa of Tables of the SunSouthern boundary of Indian Creek east to rims is the northern boundary, and the southern boundary is the USFS northern boundary. On the east the canyon rims then west to Highway 211.Comb Ridge south of Highway 95, except for proposed campgrounds and Butler Wash OHV areaOld Scenic Highway Corridor ACEC (from west to east) to the intersection with Natural BridgesArch Canyon.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Indian Creek.Arch Canyon.San Juan River Sections 1, 2, and 4.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Moqui CanyonBridger Jack Mesa slopes to ATV trails/roads on west, north, and sides, and on the east to the private land boundary.North of Highway 95 in the Comb Ridge AreaSouth Cottonwood east of Black Mesa Road.Highway 276 National Bridges area east, and southwest of UT 95 and 261 junction.Upper Montezuma Creek WatershedDry ValleyBeef Basin (portions)Area north of White CanyonCal Black Airport east areaOther areas illustrated on Map 71
637,875 acres would be managed as VRM Class IV.	608,463 acres would be managed as VRM Class IV.	693,995 acres would be managed as VRM Class IV, including but not limited to portions of Cedar Mesa areas as inventoried. Potential ACECs: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Alkali Ridge	691,119 acres would be managed as VRM Class IV.	407,459 acres would be managed as VRM Class IV.	623,002 acres would be managed as VRM Class IV, as illustrated on Map 71.

WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES RESOURCES

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Maintain, protect, and enhance habitats to support natural wildlife diversity, reproductive capability, and a healthy, self-sustaining population of wildlife and fish species.

Recognize crucial and nonfragmented habitats as management priorities.

Maintain or improve vegetation condition and/or avoid long-term disturbance in habitat sites for wildlife and fish species.

Minimize long-term habitat fragmentation as much as possible through avoidance and site-specific reclamation to provide habitat quality and quantity adequate to fulfill the life history requirements and to support a natural diversity of species.

Maintain and enhance aquatic and wildlife resources, and provide for biological diversity of plants and wildlife resources while ensuring healthy ecosystems.

MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ALTERNATIVES

Migratory Birds

Comply with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and implement the Executive Order 13186 ("Responsibilities of Federal Agencies to Protect Migratory Birds") during all activities to protect habitat for migratory birds. Management would emphasize birds listed on the current USFWS "Birds of Conservation Concern" (2002 or as updated), and Partners-in-Flight priority species (as updated). As specific habitat needs and population distribution to Birds of Conservation Concern and Partners-in-Flight priority species the Partners-In-Flight Avian Conservation Strategy (UDWR, 2000, as updated) priority species are identified, the BLM would use adaptive management strategies to further conserve habitat and avoid impacts to these species.

During nesting season for migratory birds (May 1–July 30), avoid or minimize surface-disturbing activities and vegetative-altering projects and broad-scale use of pesticides in identified occupied priority migratory bird habitat.

Prioritize the maintenance and/or improvement of lowland riparian, wetlands, and low and high desert scrub communities, which are the four most important and used habitat types by migratory birds in the Monticello PA.

Prevent the spread of invasive and non-native plants, especially cheatgrass, salt cedar, and Russian olive. Strive for a dense understory of native species with a reduction in salt cedar and improvement of cottonwood and willow regeneration.

As a supplement to comply with Executive Order 13186, the Bird Habitat Conservation Areas identified in the Coordinated Implementation Plan for Bird Conservation in Utah (2005, or as updated), would receive priority for conducting bird habitat conservation projects through cooperative funding initiatives such as the Intermountain West Joint Venture.

Land-use decisions that contain migratory birds and their habitats would consider the goals and objectives established in respective bird conservation strategies: bird conservation plans and Utah wildlife action plan.

Management of habitat for species conservation will incorporate statewide conservation strategies.

Raptors

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

<p>Raptor management would be guided by the use of Best Management Practices for Raptors and Their Associated Habitats in Utah (Utah BLM 2006, Appendix M), utilizing seasonal and spatial buffers, as well as mitigation, to maintain and enhance raptor nesting and foraging habitat, while allowing other resource uses.</p> <p>Cooperate with utility companies, UDWR, and USFWS to prevent electrocution of raptors.</p> <p>Temporarily close areas (amount of time depends on species) near raptor nests to rock climbers or other activities if activity may result in nest abandonment.</p> <p><u>Bighorn Sheep</u></p> <p>Five mesa tops (56,740 acres) within the crucial bighorn sheep habitat have been identified as areas of potential conflict between bighorn and activities that cause surface disturbance resulting in permanent loss of bighorn sheep habitat. Bighorn sheep habitat improvement projects would be prioritized in these areas.</p> <p>Livestock grazing and associated range improvement projects would not be allowed on the five mesa tops.</p> <p>Any future proposal for a change in kind of livestock from cattle to sheep in crucial desert bighorn sheep habitat would be denied in order to prevent competition for forage and the transmission of disease from domestic to wild sheep.</p> <p>Adhere to the recommendations in the BLM Bighorn Sheep Rangeland Management Plan (BLM 1993c, as revised); and the Utah BLM Statewide Desert Bighorn Sheep Management Plan, 1996 (as revised), where practicable.</p> <p><u>Introduction, Transplantation, Augmentation, and Reestablishment</u></p> <p>The BLM would continue to cooperate with and provide support to UDWR in reintroducing native fish and wildlife species into historic or suitable ranges, as determined appropriate through case-by-case NEPA analysis.</p> <p>Introduction, transplantation, augmentation, and re-establishment of both native and naturalized species would be considered and would include but may not be limited to pronghorn, desert bighorn sheep, wild turkey, beaver, chukar, Colorado River cutthroat trout, and Endangered Colorado River fish species.</p> <p><u>Animal Damage Control</u></p> <p>Predator management would continue to be coordinated with APHIS and UDWR, and would be conducted utilizing the guidance provided by the existing MOU with APHIS.</p> <p><u>Habitat Improvements and Protection</u></p> <p>In areas lacking proper water distribution or natural water sources, allow for installation of precipitation catchments (guzzlers) or the development of springs on rangelands.</p> <p>Adhere to BLM fence standards to allow wildlife movement when fences are being developed or maintained.</p> <p>Wildlife habitat objectives would be considered in all reclamation activity. Priority would be given to meeting Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management (BLM 1997).</p> <p>Adhere to the recommendations in the BLM Habitat Management Guides for the American Pronghorn Antelope (1980 as revised), wherever practicable.</p> <p>Ground-disturbing and permitted activities carried out in all seasonal wildlife protection areas would be subject to special conditions regulating use during certain seasons. These seasonal conditions would not impact maintenance and operation activities for mineral production or hunting during a recognized hunting season established by the UDWR.</p> <p>Recognize 17,300 acres as allotted to wildlife (parts of the slopes of Peter's Canyon and East Canyon).</p> <p>Ground-disturbing actions in crucial habitats would be avoided where practical. Where unavoidable disturbances are required, the BLM would follow BLM Washington Office Guidance (IM 2005-069) on application of compensatory measures.</p> <p><u>Seasonal Wildlife Protection Areas</u></p> <p>In addition to any other special conditions that may be in effect, crucial big game habitats are subject to special conditions regulating use during certain seasons. These seasonal conditions would not impact maintenance and operation activities for mineral production or hunting during a recognized hunting season established by the UDWR.</p> <p>See Appendix A, Stipulations Applicable to Oil and Gas Leasing and Other Surface Disturbing Activities, for exceptions, modifications and waivers that can be applied by the Authorized Officer, on a case-by-case basis for a myriad of reasons outlined in the appendix.</p> <p><u>Off-site Mitigation</u></p> <p>The BLM will approach compensatory mitigation on an "as appropriate" basis where it can be performed on site, and on a voluntary basis where it is performed off-site, or, in accordance with current guidance.</p> <p><u>Habitat Boundaries</u></p> <p>Minor adjustments to crucial wildlife habitat boundaries periodically made by the UDWR would be accommodated through plan maintenance.</p>					
Alternative A (No Action) (see rows below for species)	Alternative B (see rows below for species)	Alternative C (Preferred) (see rows below for species)	Alternative D (see rows below for species)	Alternative E (see rows below for species)	Proposed Plan (see rows below for species)
Unspecified.	<p>Special conditions for the seasonal wildlife protection areas include all land-use authorizations, with the exception of woodland harvest, would be required to conform to seasonal, noise, and disturbance restrictions outlined below.</p> <p>Closed to the following uses during the established season:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No oil and gas exploration, drilling and production activities or geophysical work.• No permitted or commercial OHV use.• No use of pyrotechnics, shooting,	<p>Same as Alternative B, except permitted or commercial OHV use may be limited in number of participants and duration depending on the event.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B, except all land-use authorizations, with the exception of woodland harvest, would be required to conform to seasonal and noise and disturbance restrictions outlined below.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>Special conditions for the seasonal wildlife protection areas include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• All land-use authorizations, with the exception of woodland harvest, would be required to conform to seasonal, noise, and disturbance restrictions outlined below• Closed to the following uses, among others, (refer to Appendix A) during the established season:• No oil and gas exploration, drilling and production activities or geophysical work.• Permitted or commercial OHV use may be limited in number of participants and duration depending on the event.• No use of pyrotechnics, shooting, etc. during permitted filming because of noise impacts.• No use of low-flying aircraft.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

	etc. during permitted filming because of noise impacts. <ul style="list-style-type: none">No use of low-flying aircraft.				
Bighorn Sheep Lambing and Rutting Areas					
Part of the 329,750-acre bighorn crucial habitat area (Map 78) falls in ROS classes P and SPNM. The following special conditions are in addition to the ROS special conditions, which take precedence. Crucial bighorn sheep habitat would be closed to certain surface uses during the lambing season (April 1–July 15) and the rutting (mating) season (October 15–December 31). During these periods, no oil and gas leasing activities, geophysical work, or OHV use may take place. Mining activities during these periods would require an approved plan of operations. Any future proposal for a change in kind of livestock from cattle to sheep in crucial desert bighorn sheep habitat would be denied in order to prevent competition for forage and the transmission of disease from domestic to wild sheep.	Adhere to special conditions (above) on 453,388 acres (Map 79) from April 1 to July 15 for lambing, and from October 15 to December 31 for rutting.	Adhere to special conditions (above) on 415,395 acres (Map 80) from April 1 to June 15 for lambing, and on 453,390 acres from October 15 to December 15 for rutting.	Adhere to special conditions (above) on 299,009 acres (Map 81) from April 1 to June 15 for lambing, and October 15 to December 15 for rutting.	Same as Alternative B.	Adhere to special conditions (above and Appendix A) on 453,388 acres (Map 82) from April 1 to June 15 for lambing, and from October 15 to December 15 for rutting.
Pronghorn Fawning Area					
The antelope crucial habitat area (Map 78) would not subject to the ROS special conditions. Use within the 12,960-acre crucial antelope habitat would be closed to certain surface uses during the fawning season (May 15–June 15). During this period, no oil and gas leasing activity, geophysical work, or OHV use may take place. Mining activities during this period would require an approved plan of operations.	Adhere to special conditions (above) on 29,365 acres (Map 79) from May 1 to June 15.	Adhere to special conditions (above) on 29,365 acres (Map 80) from May 1 to June 15.	Adhere to special conditions (above) on 13,961 acres (Map 81) from May 1 to June 15.	Same as Alternative B.	Adhere to special conditions (above and Appendix A) on 29,365 acres (Map 82) from May 1 to June 15.
Grazing Management in Pronghorn Ranges					
No current prescription.	Spring grazing (April 15–June 15) would be eliminated in allotments within antelope habitat and livestock utilization levels would not exceed 50% or current year's growth to encourage forb production and provide adequate cover for newborn fawns. This would include the following grazing allotments: Mail Station, Upper Mail Station, Dry Valley/Deer Neck, Lone Cedar, Tank Draw, and Hart Draw.	Current livestock-grazing prescriptions would continue and, where opportunities exist, would be adjusted to enhance forb production on pronghorn ranges. This would include the following grazing allotments: Mail Station, Upper Mail Station, Dry Valley/Deer Neck, Lone Cedar, Tank Draw, and Hart Draw.	Prescriptive livestock grazing would be used to favor forb production on pronghorn ranges. This would include the following grazing allotments: Mail Station, Upper Mail Station, Dry Valley/Deer Neck, Lone Cedar, Tank Draw, and Hart Draw.	Same as Alternative B.	Current livestock-grazing prescriptions would continue and, where opportunities exist, would be adjusted to enhance forb production on pronghorn ranges. This would include the following grazing allotments: Mail Station, Upper Mail Station, Dry Valley/Deer Neck, Lone Cedar, Tank Draw, and Hart Draw.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

Deer Winter Range					
Part of the deer crucial winter range areas fall in ROS class SPNM. The following special conditions are in addition to the ROS special conditions, which take precedence. Use within the 197,550-acre crucial deer winter habitat areas (Map 73) would be closed to certain surface uses during periods of crucial winter use (December 15–April 30). During this period, no oil and gas leasing activities, geophysical work, or OHV use may take place. Mining activities during this period would require an approved plan of operations. Certain sagebrush parks within crucial deer winter range areas (9,800 acres) have been identified as providing a concentrated food source for wintering deer. Large-scale sagebrush removal could cause a substantial loss of winter forage. The areas fall within various ROS classes; the following special conditions, which take precedence, are in addition to the ROS special conditions: Land treatments would be considered on a case-by-case basis.	Adhere to special conditions (above) on 785,921 acres (Map 74) from November 1 to May 15.	Adhere to special conditions (above) on 266,406 acres (Map 75) from November 15 to April 15.	Adhere to special conditions (above) on 182,315 acres (Map 76) from December 1 to April 15.	Same as Alternative B.	Adhere to special conditions (above and Appendix A) on 383,098 acres (Map 77) from November 15 to April 15.
Elk Winter Range					
No identified crucial elk habitat.	Adhere to special conditions (above) on 191,173 acres (Map 79) from November 1 to May 15.	Adhere to special conditions (above) on 97,471 acres (Map 80) from November 15 to April 15.	Adhere to special conditions (above) on 62,484 acres (Map 81) from December 1 to April 15.	Same as Alternative B.	Adhere to special conditions (above and Appendix A) on 97,471 acres (Map 82) from November 15 to April 15.
WOODLANDS (Maps 83–86)					
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES					
Manage woodlands for Desired Future Condition (DFC), ensuring ecological diversity, stability, and sustainability (including the desired mix of structural stages and landscape/watershed functions), and provide for native plant and wildlife habitats. Provide woodland products on a sustainable basis to meet local needs where such use does not limit the accomplishment of goals for the management of other resources. Provide opportunities for pine nut gathering on a sustainable basis while protecting other resources. Encourage, where feasible, the harvest of woodland products in areas of proposed or existing vegetative treatments to lessen the need for additional treatment or land disturbance, and in areas that need restoration for ecological benefits (for example, <i>Pinus edulis</i>). Use the document, "Recommended Old-Growth Definitions and Description, USDA Forest Service Southwestern Region (Sept. 1992)." Identify, maintain, and restore forest and woodland old-growth stands to a pre-fire suppression condition. The Monticello FO would adopt the USFS old growth definitions and identification standards as per the USFS document "Characteristics of Old-Growth Forests in the Intermountain Region (April 1993)" in instances where the area of application in the previous document doesn't apply (for example, pinyon pine).					
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ALTERNATIVES					
Implement the Healthy Forest Initiative and the Healthy Forest Restoration Act of 2003. Follow National BLM Forest Health and Forest Management Standards and Guidelines to assess conditions and guide management decisions for woodland resources. Prioritize treatment in high-value/high-risk areas (WUI, developed recreation facilities including campgrounds, FRCC III). Allow live woodland harvest in areas with pinyon pine and juniper encroachment with focus on the restoration of the sagebrush steppe community. Fuel treatment projects would allow for harvest of woodland products. Permits for private and/or commercial use of woodland products would continue to be issued to the public, consistent with the availability of woodland products and the protection of other resource values. Cottonwood and willow harvest would be allowed for Native American ceremonial uses only by permit. Restrictions on this permitted harvest would be implemented as necessary to achieve or maintain Proper Functioning Condition (PFC), and to maintain or					

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

improve threatened and endangered species/special status species (TES/SSS) habitat.					
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED PLAN AND ALL DRAFT RMP ACTION ALTERNATIVES					
Harvest woodland products (per table below) subject to the following exceptions:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Exclude from woodland product use except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires in all WSAs, Arch Canyon, Alkali Ridge NHL, Grand Gulch NHD (mesa top), Beef Basin, Fable Valley, Comb Ridge SRMA (south of Highway 95), San Juan River SRMA and in the Proposed Plan, the 5 non-WSA areas with wilderness characteristics (Map 34) (Dark Canyon, Mancos Mesa, Nokai Dome West, Nokai Dome East and Grand Gulch) carried forward to protect those values. For Alternative E, all non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Map 33) would not be available for woodland product use.Exclude from all woodland product use, including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires, all developed recreation sites, livestock/wildlife exclosures, cultural sites, Indian Creek Corridor, McLoyd Canyon–Moon House Ruin, Cedar Mesa SRMA (in-canyon), and Grand Gulch NHD (in canyon).Exclude floodplains, riparian/aquatic areas from woodland product use except for limited on-site collection of driftwood for campfires, and uses for Native American ceremonial purposes as determined on site-specific basis.Limitations on off-road travel for wood gathering would be modified as necessary to maintain long-term sustainability or facilitate wood gathering where resource impacts are not a concern.					
Permits would be limited and/or areas closed, as necessary, to maintain sustainability and protect resources.					
Alternative A (No Action) Map 83	Alternative B Map 84	Alternative C (Preferred) Map 85	Alternative D Map 85	Alternative E Map 86	Proposed Plan Map 85
Zones in Field Office considered for private and/or commercial use of woodland products: East Canyon; Harts Draw; Salt Creek Mesa; Dark Canyon Plateau; White Canyon; Cedar Mesa; North Comb Ridge; South Cottonwood; and Montezuma Watershed (Maps 83–86).					
Areas not identified in zones below, or not restricted in Management Common To All, would be available for private use of woodland products limited to designated routes and available to pinyon pine nut gathering.					
East Canyon Zone was not addressed in the 1991 San Juan Resource Area RMP, as amended.	East Canyon (64,559 acres) Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel within 150 feet of designated routes to collect wood. Peter's Point Seasonal restriction on private and/or commercial use of woodland products in the deer and elk winter range from November 1 to May 15. Big Indian, East Canyon, Peters Canyon Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel to collect wood.	East Canyon (64,559 acres) Peter's Point Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel to collect wood. Big Indian, East Canyon, Peters Canyon Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel to collect wood.	East Canyon (64,559 acres) Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel within 150 feet of designated routes to collect wood. Peter's Point Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel to collect wood. Big Indian, East Canyon, Peters Canyon Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel to collect wood.	East Canyon (64,559 acres) Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel within 150 feet of designated routes to collect wood. Peter's Point Same as Alternative B. Big Indian, East Canyon, Peters Canyon Same as Alternative B.	East Canyon (64,559 acres) (Including Peter's Point Big Indian, East Canyon, Peters Canyon, NE of Monticello, and South Canyon) Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel within 150 feet of designated routes to collect wood.
NE of Monticello, South Canyon (Part of East Canyon Zone) was not addressed in the 1991 San Juan Resource Area RMP, as amended.	NE of Monticello, South Canyon (Part of East Canyon Zone) Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel to collect wood.	NE of Monticello, South Canyon (Part of East Canyon Zone) Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel to collect wood.	NE of Monticello, South Canyon (Part of East Canyon Zone) Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel to collect wood.	NE of Monticello, South Canyon (Part of East Canyon Zone) Same as Alternative B.	NE of Monticello, South Canyon (Part of East Canyon Zone) See above.
Harts Draw Zone was not addressed in the 1991 San Juan Resource Area RMP, as amended.	Harts Point, Harts Draw, Shay Mesa, Photograph Gap/Lone Cedar (64,671 acres) Seasonal restriction on private and/or commercial use of woodland products in the deer and elk winter range November 1–May 15, and antelope fawning habitat April 15–June 30.	Harts Point, Harts Draw, Shay Mesa, Photograph Gap/Lone Cedar (64,671 acres) Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel within 150 feet of designated routes to collect wood.	Harts Point, Harts Draw, Shay Mesa, Photograph Gap/Lone Cedar (64,671 acres) Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel to collect wood.	Harts Draw (51,743 acres) Same as Alternative B.	Harts Point, Harts Draw, Shay Mesa, Photograph Gap/Lone Cedar (64,671 acres) Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel within 150 feet of designated routes to collect wood.
Salt Creek Mesa Zone was not addressed in the 1991 San Juan Resource Area RMP, as amended.	Salt Creek Mesa (5,271 acres) Seasonal restriction on private and/or commercial use of woodland	Salt Creek Mesa (5,271 acres) Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland	Salt Creek Mesa (5,271 acres) Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland	Salt Creek Mesa (5,136 acres) Same as Alternative B.	Salt Creek Mesa (5,271 acres) Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel in chained areas to collect wood.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

	products in the deer and elk winter range from November 1 to May 15.	products with permitted off-road travel to collect wood.	products with permitted off-road travel to collect wood.		
Dark Canyon Plateau Zone was not addressed in the 1991 San Juan Resource Area RMP, as amended.	Dark Canyon Plateau (23,288 acres) Seasonal restriction on private and/or commercial use of woodland products in the deer and elk winter range from November 1 to May 15.	Dark Canyon Plateau (23,288 acres) Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel within 150 feet of designated routes and permitted off-road travel in chained areas to collect wood.	Dark Canyon Plateau (23,288 acres) Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel to collect wood.	Dark Canyon Plateau (2,015 acres) Same as Alternative B.	Dark Canyon Plateau (23,288 acres) Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel within 150 feet of designated routes and permitted off-road travel in chained areas to collect wood.
White Canyon Zone was not addressed in the 1991 San Juan Resource Area RMP, as amended.	White Canyon (255,267 acres) Wooden Shoe, Deer Flat, Horse Flat (extending out toward Jacob's Chair, Pinyon Point) Seasonal restriction on private and/or commercial use of woodland products in the deer and elk winter range from November 1 to May 15, and Bighorn sheep lambing and rutting areas from October 15–December 31, and April 1–July 15. Moss Back Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel within 150 feet of designated routes to collect wood. Grand Flats Seasonal restriction on private and/or commercial use of woodland products in the deer and elk winter range November 1–May 15, and in bighorn sheep habitat April 1–July 15.	White Canyon (255,267 acres) Wooden Shoe, Deer Flat, Horse Flat (extending out toward Jacob's Chair, Pinyon Point) Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel within 150 feet of designated routes and permitted off-road travel in chained areas to collect wood. Moss Back Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel within 150 feet of designated routes to collect wood. Grand Flats Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel within 150 feet of designated routes to collect wood.	White Canyon (255,267 acres) Wooden Shoe, Deer Flat, Horse Flat (extending out toward Jacob's Chair, Pinyon Point) Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel to collect wood. Moss Back Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel to collect wood. Grand Flats Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel to collect wood.	White Canyon (177,587 acres) Wooden Shoe, Deer Flat, Horse Flat (extending out toward Jacob's Chair, Pinyon Point) Same as Alternative B. Moss Back Same as Alternative B. Grand Flats Same as Alternative B.	White Canyon (255,267 acres) Wooden Shoe, Deer Flat, Horse Flat (extending out toward Jacob's Chair, Pinyon Point) Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel within 150 feet of designated routes and permitted off-road travel in chained areas to collect wood. Moss Back and Grand Flats Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel within 150 feet of designated routes to collect wood.
Cedar Mesa Zone was not addressed in the 1991 San Juan Resource Area RMP, as amended.	Cedar Mesa (outside of WSA) (0 acres) Closed.	Cedar Mesa (outside of WSA) (65,807 acres) Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products, limited to designated routes, dependent on cultural Class III surveys.	Cedar Mesa (outside of WSA) (65,807 acres) Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products, limited to designated routes, dependent on cultural Class III surveys. In the interim of designating woodland harvest areas and associated cultural surveys, woodland use is open and travel limited to designated/existing routes.	Cedar Mesa (outside of WSA) (0 acres) Closed.	Cedar Mesa (outside of WSA) (65,807 acres) Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products, however, vehicles must remain on designated routes (no cross county travel). Additional routes may be identified for wood harvest dependent on cultural Class III surveys. In the interim of designating woodland harvest areas and completing associated cultural surveys, woodland harvest is allowed and travel is limited to designated routes.
North Comb Ridge Zone was not addressed in the 1991 San Juan Resource Area RMP, as amended.	North of Highway 95 (North Comb) (5,670 acres) Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products, limited to designated routes, dependent on cultural Class III surveys.	North of Highway 95 (North Comb) (5,833 acres) Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products, limited to designated routes, dependent on cultural Class III surveys.	North of Highway 95 (North Comb) (5,833 acres) Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products, limited to designated routes, dependent on cultural Class III surveys. In the interim of designating woodland harvest areas	North of Highway 95 (North Comb) (5,666 acres) Same as Alternative B.	North of Highway 95 (North Comb) (5,833 acres) Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products, however, vehicles must remain on designated routes (no cross county travel). Additional routes may be identified for wood harvest dependent on cultural Class III surveys. In the interim of designating woodland harvest areas and completing associated cultural surveys, woodland harvest is allowed and travel is limited to

Table 2.1. Summary Table of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives

			and associated cultural surveys, woodland use is open and travel limited to designated/existing routes.		designated routes.
South Cottonwood Zone was not addressed in the 1991 San Juan Resource Area RMP, as amended.	South Cottonwood (108,719 acres) Texas Flat Seasonal restriction on private and/or commercial use of woodland products in the deer and elk winter range from November 1 to May 15. Brushy Basin, Black Mesa, Little Baullies, Upper South Cottonwood Seasonal restriction on private and/or commercial use of woodland products in the deer and elk winter range from November 1 to May 15.	South Cottonwood (117,399 acres) Texas Flat Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel within 150 feet of designated routes and permitted off-road travel in chained areas to collect wood. Brushy Basin, Black Mesa, Little Baullies, Upper South Cottonwood Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel within 150 feet of designated routes and permitted off-road travel in chained areas to collect wood.	South Cottonwood (117,399 acres) Texas Flat Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel to collect wood. Brushy Basin, Black Mesa, Little Baullies, Upper South Cottonwood Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel to collect wood.	South Cottonwood (104,017 acres) Texas Hat Same as Alternative B. Brushy Basin, Black Mesa, Little Baullies, Upper South Cottonwood Same as Alternative B.	South Cottonwood (117,399 acres) Texas Flat Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel within 150 feet of designated routes and permitted off-road travel in chained areas to collect wood. Brushy Basin, Black Mesa, Little Baullies, Upper South Cottonwood Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel within 150 feet of designated routes and permitted off-road travel in chained areas to collect wood.
Montezuma Watershed Zone (249,673 acres) was not addressed in the 1991 San Juan Resource Area RMP, as amended.	Montezuma Watershed (202,630 acres) Seasonal restriction on private and/or commercial use of woodland products in the deer and elk winter range from November 1 to May 15. Limited to designated routes, dependent on cultural Class III surveys.	Montezuma Watershed (239,841 acres) Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products, limited to designated routes, dependent on cultural Class III surveys. Permitted off-road travel would be allowed only in chained areas.	Montezuma Watershed (239,841 acres) Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products, limited to designated routes, dependent on cultural Class III surveys. In the interim of designating woodland harvest areas and associated cultural surveys, woodland use is open and travel limited to designated/existing routes.	Montezuma Watershed (197,753 acres) Same as Alternative B.	Montezuma Watershed (239,841 acres) Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products, however, vehicles must remain on designated routes (no cross county travel). Additional routes may be identified for wood harvest dependent on cultural Class III surveys. In the interim of designating woodland harvest areas and completing associated cultural surveys, woodland harvest is allowed and travel is limited to designated routes.

2.2 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

Table 2.2 provides a comparative summary of the environmental impacts associated with each alternative. The BLM evaluated the environmental impacts that would result from the implementation of the various management decisions proposed under the five alternatives described above. Alternative A (No Action), a continuation of the existing 1991 San Juan RMP, is presented for comparison to the action alternatives.

Impacts are defined as modifications to the existing environment brought about by implementing an alternative. Impacts can be beneficial or adverse, result from the action directly or indirectly, and can be long-term, short-term, or cumulative in nature. Direct impacts are caused by the action and occur at the same time and place. Indirect impacts are caused by the action and are later in time or farther removed in distance, but are still reasonably foreseeable (CEQ 1508.8). Cumulative impacts are impacts on the environment that result from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions (CEQ 1508.7). If impacts are not discussed, the analysis has indicated that none would occur or their magnitude would be negligible. Impacts from actions to be carried out under more than one alternative are discussed under the first applicable alternative. Cumulative impacts are discussed in Chapter 4 for all of the resources instead of under each resource section.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

AIR QUALITY						
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Fire Management	Short-term air quality impacts include and increase in PM2.5 particulate and CO2 emissions specific to the burn area and locations downwind. Long-term, direct air-quality impacts include a general increase in airborne particulate materials from the burn site as a result of ash dispersion and transport.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Minerals and Energy Resources	Impacts of mineral extraction management decisions on air quality under Alternative A would maintain existing levels of use without additional constraints and not exceed NAAQS.	Impacts of mineral extraction management decisions under Alternative B would result in a reduction of approximately 9% in opportunities for oil and gas extraction as compared to Alternative A, with impacts on NAAQS similar to or slightly lower than Alternative A.	Impacts of mineral extraction management decisions under Alternative C would result in an increase of approximately 1% in opportunities for oil and gas extraction as compared to Alternative A, with impacts on NAAQS similar to Alternative A.	Impacts of mineral extraction management decisions under Alternative D would result in an increase of approximately 1% in opportunities for oil and gas extraction as compared to Alternative A, with impacts on NAAQS similar to Alternative A.	Impacts of mineral extraction management decisions under Alternative E would result in a reduction of approximately 26% in opportunities for oil and gas extraction as compared to Alternative A, with impacts on NAAQS similar to or lower than Alternative A.	Impacts of mineral extraction management decisions under the Proposed Plan would result in an increase of approximately 1% in opportunities for oil and gas extraction as compared to Alternative A, with impacts on NAAQS similar to Alternative A.
Recreation	Minor, short-term, adverse air quality impacts from OHVs, automobiles, and other combustion	Impacts to air quality resulting from Alternative B would be less than Alternative A due to	Under Alternative C, recreation management decisions would result in minor additional	Under Alternative D, recreation management decisions would result in minor	Under Alternative E, recreation management decisions would result in additional	Under the Proposed Plan, recreation management decisions would result in minor additional

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	exhaust sources. Projected air quality constituents of concern specific to recreational use would include particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5), hydrocarbons and combustion by-products. Long-term, beneficial impacts from prescriptions that improve road surfaces, limit vegetation disturbances, and reduce OHV and other vehicle use.	additional constraints on motorized recreation.	constraints to motorized vehicle use as compared to Alternative A. Adverse impacts to air quality similar to Alternative A.	additional constraints to motorized vehicle use as compared to Alternative A. Adverse impacts to air quality similar to Alternative A.	constraints to motorized vehicle use as compared to Alternative A, specifically for areas that contain non-WSA areas with wilderness characteristics. Adverse impacts to air quality similar to or slightly smaller than Alternative A.	constraints to motorized vehicle use as compared to Alternative A. Adverse impacts to air quality similar to Alternative A.
CULTURAL RESOURCES						
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Cultural Resources	Long-term, adverse impacts to cultural resources from the lack of restrictions on surface disturbance, OHV use, and other recreational uses, but with beneficial impacts from protection of high site-density areas on 37,433 acres in Grand Gulch Special Emphasis Area.	Same impacts as Alternative A, except additional beneficial impacts on 98,348 acres of high site-density areas from special protection of cultural resources. Long term, beneficial impacts from limiting OHV use to designated routes.	Same impacts as Alternative B.	Same impacts as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B, except additional beneficial impacts from protection of 582,357 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics	Same as Alternative B, except additional beneficial impacts from protection of 88,871 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics
Fire Management	Potential for negligible to minor adverse impacts on cultural resources from	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	wildland fire on 33,556 acres of high and moderate site-density. Negligible impacts on cultural resources from restrictions on fuels reduction treatments within NRHP-eligible sites.					
Health and Safety	Minor, adverse, long term impacts to historic mine structures from AML site remediation.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Livestock Grazing	Improved stability of cultural sites in the Comb Wash side canyons from grazing unavailability. Long-term, adverse impacts to cultural resources outside of these areas (90% of areas with high site-density and 94% with moderate site density) where sites may be impacted by livestock trampling or brushing against structures and/or rock art.	Improved stability of cultural sites from grazing unavailability in selected allotments. Long-term, moderately beneficial impacts from grazing restrictions. Potential long-term adverse impacts outside of these areas where sites may be impacted by livestock trampling.	Same impacts as Alternative B.	Same impacts as Alternative A,	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Mineral and Energy Resources	Potential long-term, adverse impacts within 417 acres of high site density lands and 313 acres of medium site density lands. Adverse impacts from	Same impacts as Alternative A, except that fewer acres (338 acres) in high and medium (298 acres) site density areas would potentially be disturbed by minerals	Same impacts as Alternative A, except that slightly fewer acres (381 acres) in high site density areas and 391 acres in medium site-density areas could	Same as Alternative A, except that slightly fewer acres (391 acres total) in high site density areas are projected for disturbance associated with	Same as Alternative B, except that fewer acres (327 acres total) in high and medium (192 acres total) site density areas are projected for disturbance	Same as Alternative A, except that slightly fewer acres (393 acres total) in high site density areas are projected for disturbance associated with

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	geophysical exploration on 886 acres.	development. Same geophysical impacts as Alternative A.	be impacted by minerals development. Slightly greater geophysical impacts than Alternative A from impacts to 903 acres.	minerals development. More acres (330 total) in medium site density areas are projected for disturbance under Alternative D.	associated with minerals development.	minerals development. Fewer acres (299 total) in medium site density areas are projected for disturbance. Slightly greater geophysical impacts than Alternative A from impacts to 903 acres
Non-WSA lands with Wilderness Characteristics	Same impacts to cultural resources within these areas as discussed under other resources, as non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would not be protected under this alternative.	Same impacts to cultural resources as discussed under Alternative B resources, as non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would not be protected under this alternative.	Same impacts to cultural resources as discussed under Alternative C resources, as non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would not be protected under this alternative.	Same impacts to cultural resources as discussed under Alternative D resources, as non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would not be protected under this alternative.	582,360 acres protected as non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, which does not allow surface-disturbing activities or OHV access.	Same impacts to cultural resources as discussed under Alternative E, five units would be managed to protect wilderness characteristics for a total of 88,871 acres.
Paleontology	Minor to moderate, long-term, beneficial impacts from protections afforded to paleontologically sensitive geologic formations. Minor, adverse impacts to sites from fossil collection.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Recreation	Impacts are the same as described for cultural resource management decisions because of program overlap.	Impacts are the same as described for cultural resource management decisions because of program overlap.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B, except that there would be a negligible increase in adverse impacts because of larger commercial group sizes allowed in high site-density

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

						areas.
Riparian Resources	Negligible to minor, beneficial impacts to cultural resources from restrictions on surface-disturbing activity within riparian and floodplain areas.	Same impacts as Alternative A, except additional beneficial impacts from additional restrictions on OHV use and livestock grazing by reducing opportunities for surface disturbances.	Same impacts as Alternative B.	Same impacts as Alternative A.	Same impacts as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Special Designations, ACECs	Alkali Ridge ACEC Long-term beneficial impacts to cultural resources within the 39,202-acre ACEC from the use of disturbance avoidance buffers around known sites. Long-term, adverse impacts from allowable surface-disturbing activities in areas outside of known sites.	Alkali Ridge ACEC Same as Alternative A for the 39,196-acre ACEC, but with greater long-term beneficial impacts and decreased potential for long-term adverse impacts from restrictions on surface disturbances.	Alkali Ridge ACEC Same as Alternative A for this 39,196-acre ACEC, but with slightly greater long-term beneficial impacts and decreased opportunities for long-term adverse impacts from OHV travel restrictions for woodland harvesting.	Alkali Ridge ACEC Same as Alternative A, but with less long-term benefits and greater potential for long-term adverse impacts because of fewer restrictions on surface-disturbing activities.	Alkali Ridge ACEC Same as Alternative B.	Alkali Ridge ACEC Same as Alternative A for the 39,196-acre ACEC, but with greater long-term beneficial impacts and decreased potential for long-term adverse impacts from restrictions on surface disturbances.
	Bridger Jack Mesa ACEC Long-term, beneficial impacts from protection under WSA land status.	Bridger Jack Mesa ACEC Same as Alternative A.	Bridger Jack Mesa ACEC This area would not be designated as an ACEC.	Bridger Jack Mesa ACEC This area would not be designated as an ACEC.	Bridger Jack Mesa ACEC Same as Alternative A.	Bridger Jack Mesa ACEC This area would not be designated as an ACEC.
	Butler Wash North ACEC Same as Bridger Jack Mesa ACEC above.	Butler Wash North ACEC Same impacts as Alternative A.	Butler Wash North ACEC This area would not be designated as an ACEC.	Butler Wash North ACEC This area would not be designated as an ACEC.	Butler Wash North ACEC Same as Alternative A.	Butler Wash North ACEC This area would not be designated as an ACEC.
	Cedar Mesa ACEC	Cedar Mesa ACEC	Cedar Mesa ACEC	Cedar Mesa ACEC	Cedar Mesa ACEC Same as Alternative B.	Cedar Mesa ACEC

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	Long-term, beneficial impacts within 295,336-acre area from designated OHV use, specific protection of at-risk cultural resources, and areas managed for scenic quality and non-motorized uses.	Long-term, beneficial impacts from limiting day use and overnight camping to protect cultural resources within 306,742-acre area.	This area would not be designated as an ACEC.	This area would not be designated as an ACEC.	except additional beneficial impacts from decreased surface disturbances of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	This area would not be designated as an ACEC.
	Dark Canyon ACEC Long-term, beneficial impacts from protection under WSA land status.	Dark Canyon ACEC Same as Alternative A.	Dark Canyon ACEC This area would not be designated as an ACEC.	Dark Canyon ACEC This area would not be designated as an ACEC.	Dark Canyon ACEC Same as Alternative A.	Dark Canyon ACEC This area would not be designated as an ACEC.
	Hovenweep ACEC Impacts would be same as Cedar Mesa ACEC.	Hovenweep ACEC Impacts same as Alternative A.	Hovenweep ACEC Impacts same as Alternative A.	Hovenweep ACEC ACEC would not be established, with Increased potential for adverse, long-term impacts from minerals development, vegetation treatment projects, and recreational activities, including OHV use.	Hovenweep ACEC Same as Alternative B.	Hovenweep ACEC Impacts same as Alternative A, except potentially beneficial impacts from management of visual protection zone as VRM Class II.
	Indian Creek ACEC Long-term beneficial impacts to cultural resources from management decisions that would limit surface disturbances and close the area to OHV use.	Indian Creek ACEC Impacts same as A	Indian Creek ACEC Impacts same as B, except that the ACEC would be reduced in area by 54%.	Indian Creek ACEC The ACEC would not be established, with increased potential for long-term adverse impacts to cultural resources that lie outside of WSAs from lack of specific resource protections. Beneficial impacts	Indian Creek ACEC Same as Alternative B, except additional beneficial impacts from decreased surface disturbances of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	Indian Creek ACEC Impacts same as B, except that ACEC would be reduced in area by 54%. Potential beneficial impacts from designation of ROW avoidance area.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

				on cultural resources from designated OHV use.		
	Lockhart Basin ACEC The area would not be managed as an ACEC. Long-term, beneficial impacts on cultural resources from VRM II surface disturbance restrictions, prohibitions on woodcutting, and closure of the area to OHV use.	Lockhart Basin ACEC Impacts to resources and users same as A, but to a greater degree, from designation as a 47,783-acre ACEC and restrictions on surface disturbance under VRM I objectives.	Lockhart Basin ACEC Not designated as an ACEC. Increased potential for adverse impacts from mineral leasing, livestock grazing, and OHV use on designated routes in VRM III areas.	Lockhart Basin ACEC Impacts same as Alternative C.	Lockhart Basin ACEC Same as Alternative B, except additional beneficial impacts from decreased surface disturbances of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	Lockhart Basin ACEC Impacts same as Alternative C.
	Lavender Mesa ACEC Designated as a 649-acre ACEC, with long-term, beneficial impacts on cultural resources from protection of visual, cultural, and natural resources.	Lavender Mesa ACEC Impacts same as Alternative A.	Lavender Mesa ACEC Impacts same as Alternative A.	Lavender Mesa ACEC The ACEC would not be established, with increased potential for long-term, adverse impacts from unrestricted surface-disturbing activities.	Lavender Mesa ACEC Same as Alternative B, except additional beneficial impacts from decreased surface disturbances of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	Lavender Mesa ACEC Impacts same as Alternative A, but with greater long-term beneficial impacts and decreased potential for long-term adverse impacts from restrictions on surface disturbances.
	Shay Canyon ACEC Management of the 3,561-acre ACEC for cultural conservation, with long-term, beneficial impacts from protective buffers around cultural resources that are eligible for the NRHP, management under VRM I	Shay Canyon ACEC Managed as a 119-acre ACEC, with long-term beneficial impacts from surface disturbance prohibitions, closed to camping, and grazing restrictions. Long term, beneficial impacts in areas closed or limited to	Shay Canyon ACEC Impacts identical to Alternative B.	Shay Canyon ACEC Long-term, adverse impacts on cultural resources from management under VRM III objectives, open to livestock grazing, and subject to fuels and watershed treatments.	Shay Canyon ACEC Same as Alternative B, except additional beneficial impacts from decreased surface disturbances of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	Shay Canyon ACEC Same as Alternative B but with potential beneficial impacts from designation as a ROW avoidance area.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	conditions, exclusion of private and commercial woodland harvesting, and conditional fire suppression. Potential for long-term, adverse impacts from minerals activities, and livestock grazing. Adverse impacts from open OHV use.	OHV routes.				
	San Juan River ACEC The area would be managed as a 15,100-acre ACEC, with impacts same as the San Juan River SRMA.	San Juan River ACEC Managed as a 7,590-acre ACEC, with long-term, beneficial impacts on cultural resources from actions that limit or restrict surface disturbances and provide for closure of areas to protect specific cultural sites.	San Juan River ACEC Impacts the same as Alternative B.	San Juan River ACEC No designation of ACEC, with impacts same as Alternative B. Greater surface disturbance would be allowable, with greater potential for long-term, adverse impacts to cultural resources.	San Juan River ACEC Same as Alternative B, except additional beneficial impacts from decreased surface disturbances of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics..	San Juan River ACEC Impacts the same as Alternative B except for ACEC would be reduced by 43%. Potential beneficial impacts from designation of Segments 1, 2 and 3 as ROW avoidance areas.
	Valley of the Gods ACEC Managed as 31,387-acre ACEC under VRM I objectives, with long term, beneficial impacts from limitations on surface disturbances. Potential for long-term adverse impacts from livestock grazing, woodland harvesting, and minerals activities, and OHV	Valley of the Gods ACEC Managed as a 22,863-acre ACEC, with impacts same as A. Slightly increased beneficial impacts to cultural resources within the smaller ACEC from closure to woodland harvesting.	Valley of the Gods ACEC Impacts same as Alternative B.	Valley of the Gods ACEC No designation of an ACEC and management under VRM III would have potential for long-term, adverse impacts to cultural resources through greater allowance of surface-disturbing activities than under any other alternative.	Valley of the Gods ACEC Same as Alternative B, except additional beneficial impacts from decreased surface disturbances of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	ACEC Impacts the same as Alternative B but with potential beneficial impacts from designation as ROW exclusion areas.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	use.					
Special Designations, WSRs	WSR Colorado Segments Negligible impact on cultural resources from prohibitions on surface disturbances.	WSR Colorado Segments Long-term, beneficial impact on cultural resources from management of Segments 2 and 3 under VRM I and II, and from closure of Segment 3 to OHV use.	WSR Colorado Segments Impacts same as Alternative B.	WSR Colorado Segments Increased potential for long-term, adverse impacts to cultural resources from a lack of special restrictions on surface-disturbing activities.	WSR Colorado Segments Same as Alternative B, except additional beneficial impacts from decreased surface disturbances of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics in Segments 2 and 3..	WSR Colorado Segments Impacts same as Alternative B.
	WSR San Juan River Segments Long-term, beneficial impacts to cultural resources from management under VRM I restrictions on surface-disturbing activities.	WSR San Juan River Segments Long-term beneficial impacts on cultural resources from implementation of NSO stipulations and restrictions on mineral disposal and geophysical work.	WSR San Juan River Segments Long-term adverse impacts to cultural resources from not designating the area as suitable and subsequent increases in surface-disturbing activities.	WSR San Juan River Segments Same as Alternative C.	WSR San Juan River Segments Same as Alternative B, except additional beneficial impacts from decreased surface disturbances of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics in Segments 3 and 4..	WSR San Juan River Segments Same as Alternative C but additional beneficial impacts from closure to leasing and OHV use, and designation as VRM Class I and ROW exclusion area in Segment 5
	WSR All Other Segments Long-term adverse impacts from not evaluating river segments for suitability and not implementing restrictions on surface-disturbing activities.	WSR All Other Segments Long-term beneficial and adverse impacts from management under VRM II and III, and application of Standard or NSO oil and gas leasing stipulations.	WSR All Other Segments Long-term adverse impacts from not designating rivers segments as suitable and implementing related restrictions on surface-disturbing activities.	WSR All Other Segments Same as Alternative C.	WSR All Other Segments Same as Alternative B, except additional beneficial impacts from decreased surface disturbances of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics in Dark Canyon, Fable Valley and Indian Creek.	WSR All Other Segments Same as Alternative C.
Special Designations, WSAs	387,410 acres would be protected to meet the non-impairment criteria of the IMP,	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	which limits surface-disturbing activities and access.					
Special Status Species	Long-term beneficial impacts from spatial buffers with restrictions on surface-disturbing activities and vegetation treatments.	Impacts as Alternative A, except slightly more beneficial impacts from increased spatial buffers.	Greater long term, beneficial impacts than Alternatives A and B from increased spatial buffers.	Impacts same as Alternative A.	Impacts same as Alternative B.	Similar long-term beneficial impact on as Alternatives B and C because of the similar buffer areas and restrictions .
Travel Management	Long-term, beneficial impacts to cultural resources on 142,008 acres of high site-density area that is closed to OHV use. Long-term adverse impacts to cultural resources on 423,619 acres open to OHV use in high site-density areas.	Long-term, beneficial impacts to cultural resources on 238,879 acres of high site density area that is closed to OHV use, and 325,669 acres of high site-density where OHV use is limited to designated routes.	Long-term, beneficial impacts to cultural resources on 234,890 acres of high site density area that is closed to OHV use and 750,153 acres limited to designated routes.	Long-term, beneficial impacts on cultural resources from limiting OHV use to designated routes on 985,043 acres in high site-density areas.	Same as Alternative B except that 474,291 acres of high site-density lands would be beneficially closed to OHV use.	Same as Alternative B except that 234,604 acres of high site-density lands would be beneficially closed to OHV use.
Vegetation	Impacts same as Fire Management because treatments and impacts are the same.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Visual Resources	Long-term, beneficial impacts on cultural resources from protection of 395,797 acres of high site-density and 330,313 acres of medium site-density under VRM Class I and Class II designations. Potentially adverse impacts to cultural resources on lands designated as VRM	Long-term, beneficial impacts on cultural resources from management of 431,797 acres in high site-density and 315,022 acres of medium site-density under VRM Class I and II, with slightly more benefit than Alternative A. Adverse impact to cultural resources	Long-term, beneficial impacts on cultural resources from management of 324,539 acres of high site-density and 242,876 acres of medium site-density under VRM Class I and II. Slightly less beneficial impacts than Alternative A from designation of 1,225,915 acres as	Long-term, beneficial impacts from management of 237,057 acres of high site-density and 162,201 acres of medium site-density under VRM Class I and II designations. Slightly higher benefit than Alternative A. Long term, adverse impacts from	Long-term, beneficial impacts on cultural resources from management of 565,528 acres of high site-density and 544,314 acres of medium site-density under VRM Class I and II objectives. Slightly higher benefit than Alternatives A and B. Adverse impact to cultural resources	Long-term, beneficial impacts on cultural resources from management of 351,283 acres in high site-density and 299,745 acres of medium site-density under VRM Class I and II, with slightly less benefit than Alternative A.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	Class III and IV (1,054,681 acres).	from designation of 1,034,813 acres as VRM Class III and IV.	VRM Class III and IV.	designation of 1,383,860 acres as VRM Class III and IV.	from designation of 671,828 acres as VRM Class III and IV.	
Wildlife and Fisheries Resources	Negligible impacts on cultural resources from seasonal restrictions.	Same as Alternative A, but with moderate long-term, beneficial impacts from on minor restrictions on OHV use and minerals development.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Woodlands	Long-term, direct and indirect adverse impacts to cultural resources on 464,446 acres of high site- density and 392,559 acres of medium site- density from a lack of restrictions on woodland harvesting and related OHV use.	Slightly less long-term adverse impacts than Alternative A from designating 307,179 acres in high site density areas and 504,391 acres in medium density areas as open to woodland harvesting, with limited restrictions on related OHV travel. Long-term beneficial impacts to cultural resources in areas closed to woodland harvesting, especially in the Cedar Mesa CRSMA.	Impacts same as Alternative B, from designating 367,319 acres of high site- density and 229,492 acres of medium site- density as available for woodland harvesting.	Same as Alternative C.	Similar to Alternative B, except fewer acres (241,712 total) of high site density lands and 129,498 acres of medium site-density would be open to woodland harvesting, with greater long-term beneficial impact to cultural resources from less opportunity for surface disturbances.	Similar to Alternative A, except more acres (507,753 total) of high site density lands and 333,708 acres of medium site-density would be open to woodland harvesting. However, potential impacts to cultural resources from woodlands management decisions under the Proposed Plan would probably be lower than those anticipated for Alternative A because the Proposed Plan imposes greater travel restrictions and requirements for cultural-resource inventories.
FIRE MANAGEMENT						
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

Air Quality	All prescribed burns would be in accordance with applicable air quality regulations and the Smoke Management MOU, which could impact the size and timing of fire management activities. Limitations would not substantially reduce the effectiveness of fire management or increase fire risk.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Cultural Resources	Restrictions on pinyon-juniper treatments on 26,902 acres to protect cultural resources would adversely increase fuel loading, slightly increasing the risk of wildland fire. Restrictions on woodland harvesting on 26,915 acres to protect would adversely increase fuel loading in pinyon-juniper and confer, unless other treatments were used.	Adverse impacts on fire management on 46,042 acres from fire management restrictions in pinyon-juniper and prohibitions on treatments in the 37,388-acre Grand Gulch Historic District to protect cultural resources. Restrictions on woodland harvesting on 79,163 acres to protect would adversely increase fuel loading in pinyon-juniper and confer. Adverse restrictions on fuels management would be the greatest under this alternative and Alternative E.	Same types and acres of potential fire management treatments as Alternative A, but with additional beneficial impacts from additional 26,902 acres available for fire management in pinyon-juniper. Restrictions on woodland harvesting on 45,703 acres to protect would adversely increase fuel loading in pinyon-juniper and confer as compared to Alternative A.	Similar impacts as Alternative C, as restricted acreages are similar.	Same impacts as Alternative B as restricted acreages are the same.	Same impacts as Alternative C, but with slightly decreased fire risk from lack of woodland harvesting prohibitions on treatments on 20,302 acres in Beef Basin.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

Fire Management	5,000-10,000 acres per year of prescribed fire and non-fire treatments would beneficially reduce fuels and lessen wildfire severity in the long term.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Lands and Realty	Beneficial, but minor, risk reduction of accidental fire starts due to limits on the number of people and vehicles associated with filming, and on the use of pyrotechnics and explosives.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Mineral and Energy Resources	Adverse, but minor, increase in fire risks from creation of additional WUI areas.	Impacts similar to Alternative A, but slightly greater.	Impacts similar to Alternative A, but slightly greater..	Same as Alternative A. but slightly greater. Alternative D has the greatest amount of land available for surface-disturbing mineral extraction	Same as Alternative A. but less, as Alternative E has the least amount of land available for surface-disturbing mineral extraction	Impacts similar to Alternative A, but slightly greater.
Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	Negligible impacts to fire management, as non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would not be protected (with no prohibitions on fuel load reductions and treatments.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Adversely increased risks of fire from prohibitions on treatments and fuel load reductions on 582,360 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics	Adversely increased risks of fire from prohibitions on treatments and fuel load reductions on 88,871 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics
Recreation	Adverse, but minor, impacts from risks of human-caused fire in campgrounds and from dispersed	Same as Alternative A, but with additional adverse impacts from 495,825 acres of SRMAs unavailable	Same as Alternative A, but with additional adverse impacts from 120,091 acres of SRMAs unavailable	Same as Alternative A, but with additional adverse impacts from 120,091 acres of SRMAs	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative C

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	camping campfires, and increased number of WUI areas and developed recreation areas, would reduce the number of acres available for wildland fire use and be unavailable for woodland harvest.	for woodland harvest. SRP requirements for 15+ OHV/vehicles would provide some opportunity for wildfire education as compared to Alternative A.	for woodland harvest. SRP requirements for 25+ OHV/vehicles would provide some opportunity for wildfire education as compared to Alternative A.	unavailable for woodland harvest.		
Special Designations	Adverse impacts from additional fuel loading that would increase the risk of wildland fire from restrictions on vegetation treatments over 386,027 acres in WSAs and 7,099 acres in ACECs; and woodland harvest prohibitions on 114,461 acres of pinyon-juniper and conifer areas in ACECs.	Adverse impacts from additional fuel loading that would increase the risk of wildland fire from restrictions on vegetation treatments over 386,027 acres in WSAs and 59,079 acres in ACECs; and woodland harvest prohibition in 353,858 acres of pinyon-juniper and conifer areas in ACECs. Adverse restrictions on fuels management would be the greatest under this alternative and Alternative E.	Reduced risks of fuel loading from fewer vegetation treatments restrictions on treatments (386,027 acres in WSAs and 608 acres in ACECs); woodland harvest prohibitions in 49,998 acres of pinyon-juniper and conifer areas of ACECs.	Reduced risks of fuel loading from fewest restrictions on fuel treatments (386,027 acres of WSAs and 0 acres in ACECs); woodland harvest prohibitions in 47,285 acres of pinyon-juniper and conifer areas. Adverse restrictions on fuels management would be the least under this alternative.	Same impacts as Alternative B.	Same impacts as Alternative C, but slightly increased except woodland harvest would be prohibited on 107,507 acres of pinyon-juniper and conifer areas of ACECs.
Travel	Adverse, impacts from risks of human-caused fire on 611,310 acres open to cross country travel, due to inadvertent fire starts	Beneficial, impacts by prohibiting all cross country travel, limiting OHV use to existing and designated routes and closing 423,698 acres of	Beneficial impacts by limiting to cross country travel to 2,331 acres and closing 418,667 acres of trails to OHV use.	Impacts similar to C, but not as beneficial as no routes would be closed.	Impacts similar to Alternative B, except 970,435 acres of routes would be closed. This alternative would have the most	Beneficial impacts by limiting to cross country travel to 97 acres and closing 393,909 acres of trails to OHV use.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	from motorized vehicles.	trails to OHV use.			beneficial impacts on fire management.	
HEALTH AND SAFETY						
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Health and Safety	Hazardous material health and safety risks from mineral exploration and development on 69% of the PA open to standard and special mineral leasing stipulations.	Same as Alternative A, as 70% of PA would open to minerals exploration and development.	Same as Alternative A, except 76% of PA open to standard and special leasing would create minimal additional risks to health and safety.	Same as Alternative C, as approximately 78% of PA would be open to standard and special minerals leasing stipulations, with activities that could cause risks to health and safety.	Permitted standard and special minerals leasing on 43% of PA would moderately reduce the potential risks to health and safety from minerals exploration and development activities.	Same as Alternative A, as approximately 69% of the PA would open to mineral exploration and development.
LANDS AND REALTY						
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Lands and Realty	Not addressed in current RMP	Application of the minimum impact criteria for filming permits would facilitate use of public lands for this purpose while protecting other resources and meeting the resource goals and objectives of the RMP by streamlining the permit application and encouraging the use of previously approved locations that meet the minimal impact criteria.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Lands and Realty	Not addressed in current RMP.	Wind and solar energy development would be permissible; best management	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

		practices from the Final Wind Energy Programmatic EIS would be stipulated in ROW grants. Implementation would allow Monticello PA lands to be used for alternative energy and communications uses, but BMPs could add to the cost to site and construct facilities.				
Lands and Realty	120,800 acres of ROW exclusion and 253,790 acres of avoidance areas would restrict ROW placement, limit future access, increase energy supply costs, or delay the availability of communication services.	Impacts similar to Alternative A, but greater as there would be 416,612 acres of proposed ROW exclusion areas and 125,105 acres of ROW avoidance areas.	Impacts similar to Alternative A, but greater as there would be 395,329 acres of ROW exclusion areas and 39,323 acres of ROW avoidance areas.	Impacts less than Alternative A, as there would be 86,853 acres of ROW exclusion areas and 14,175 acres of ROW avoidance areas.	Impacts similar to Alternative A, but greater as there would be 974,463 acres of ROW exclusion, and 53,915 acres of ROW avoidance.	Impacts similar to Alternative A, but greater as there would be 493,400 acres of ROW exclusion areas and 66,108 acres of ROW avoidance areas.
Lands and Realty	132,380 acres would be recommended for mineral withdrawal, resulting in potentially fewer opportunities for mineral resource development and less production and supply of mineral resources.	Impacts similar to Alternative A, but greater, as 251,710 acres are recommended for mineral withdrawal.	Impacts similar to Alternative A, but slightly less, as 121,912 acres are recommended for mineral withdrawal.	Impacts similar to Alternative A, but less, as 46,131 acres are recommended for mineral withdrawal.	Impacts similar to Alternative A, but much greater, as 834,070 acres are recommended for mineral withdrawal.	Impacts similar to Alternative D, but slightly greater, as 50,665 acres recommended for mineral withdrawal.
LIVESTOCK GRAZING						
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

Cultural Resources	Long term, beneficial impacts from Comb Ridge, Tank Bench, Beef Basin, and Grand Gulch National Historic District beneficially open to grazing (except Grand Gulch Canyon and associated tributaries). Minor impacts from acres unavailable to grazing within Grand Gulch Special Emphasis Area.	Same impacts as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Fire Management	Short-term, adverse impacts on livestock grazing in treated areas. Long-term, beneficial impacts from reduced risk of fire and improved forage productivity.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Health and Safety	Negligible impacts on livestock grazing in the short-term. Reclamation of mine sites could beneficially expand grazing opportunities in the long-term.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Lands and Realty	Land exchanges and sales could adversely decrease forage in AUMs available to livestock, but acquisitions could beneficially increase acres and AUMs	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	available for livestock. Short-term loss of AUMs from construction activities. Long term loss of AUMs and forage acres from facility construction.					
Livestock Grazing	Adverse impacts to grazing from existing and proposed areas unavailable for livestock grazing.	Same impacts as Alternative A, except additional areas would be designated as unavailable for livestock grazing.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Minerals and Energy Resources	Surface-disturbing activities on 699 total acres under this alternative could lead to long term, adverse losses of AUMs and acres available to livestock grazing.	Same impacts as Alternative A, except surface disturbances would total 636 acres.	Minor, adverse impacts from surface disturbances totaling 710 acres.	Long term, adverse impacts from surface disturbances totaling 721 acres.	Same as Alternative A, except surface disturbances would total 519 acres.	Same as Alternative C.
Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	Negligible impacts to livestock grazing.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Long term, beneficial impacts to livestock grazing on 582,357 acres of lands with non-WSA wilderness characteristics from no surface disturbances to vegetation, and no OHV disturbances.	Same as Alternative A.
Recreation	Negligible impacts from grazing prohibitions within Pearson Canyon and developed recreation sites. Beneficial impacts from allowed grazing in San Juan River SRMA and the	Same as Alternative A, except adverse impacts from timing restrictions in San Juan River SRMA riparian areas.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	Cedar Mesa CSRMA.					
Riparian Resources	Short term, adverse decrease in the acres and AUMs available to livestock from exclusion, seasonal closure, and forage limitations to improve riparian areas. Long-term beneficial impacts from increase in acres and/or AUMs available to livestock after riparian rehabilitation.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Soil and Water Resources	Short term and long term decreases in acres or AUMs available to livestock from mitigation to improve damaged soils.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Special Designations, ACECs	Long term, adverse impacts to grazing from unavailable acreages in ACECs.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Special Designations, WSRs	Minor impacts to livestock grazing from prohibitions or limits on livestock structure construction and fencing.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Special Designations, Wilderness	Minor impacts to livestock grazing from prohibitions or limits on livestock structure construction and fencing.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

Travel Management	Long term, adverse impacts from 611,310 acres open to cross-country OHV use from noise disturbances, and reduction of vegetation/forage productivity.	Long term, beneficial impacts from reduction of noise impacts and surface disturbances to forage. No acres would be managed as open to OHV use.	Same as Alternative B, except approximately 2,311 acres would be managed as open to cross-country OHV use.	Same as Alternative C; 2,311 acres would be managed as open to cross-country OHV use.	Same as Alternative C; 2,311 acres would be managed as open to cross-country OHV use.	Same as Alternative B. No acres would be managed as open to OHV use.
Vegetation	Short-term, adverse impacts on livestock grazing in areas that are closed following vegetation treatments (232,130 acres). Long-term, beneficial impacts from improved forage conditions and productivity.	Same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree, treatments on approximately 152,000 acres over 20 years.	Same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree, treatments on approximately 186,000 acres over 20 years.	Same as Alternative A, from treatments impacts to 226,000 acres over 20 years.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B; treatments on approximately 186,000 acres over 20 years
MINERALS AND ENERGY RESOURCES						
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Minerals and Energy Resources, Open to Leasing	Approximately 1,238,230 acres (69.4% of BLM lands) would be beneficially open under standard and special stipulations.	Approximately 1,241,910 acres would be open under standard and special stipulations. This decision would result in a more beneficial impact to minerals resources compared to A, as 0.3% more acres would be open to leasing.	Approximately 1,348,973 acres would be open under standard and special stipulations. This decision would result in a more beneficial impact compared to A, as 8.9% more acres would be open to leasing.	Approximately 1,383,283 acres would be open under standard and special stipulations. This decision would result in a more beneficial impact compared to A, as 11.7% more acres would be open to leasing.	Approximately 758,929 acres would be open under standard and special stipulations. This decision would result in an adverse impact to minerals resources, compared to A, as 26.9% fewer acres would be open to leasing.	Approximately 1,224,911 acres would be open under standard and special stipulations. This decision would be less beneficial to minerals resources compared to A, as 13,319 acres less would be available for leasing.
Minerals and Energy Resources, Oil and Gas Wells	An average of 73 RFD-predicted oil and gas wells would be drilled over the next fifteen years.	An average of 66 RFD-predicted oil and gas wells would be drilled over the next fifteen years, with adverse impacts	An average of 74 RFD-predicted oil and gas wells would be drilled over the next fifteen years, with beneficial impacts	An average of 75 RFD-predicted oil and gas wells would be drilled over the next fifteen years, with beneficial	An average of 54 RFD-predicted oil and gas wells would be drilled over the next fifteen years, with adverse impacts	An average of 72 RFD-predicted oil and gas wells would be drilled over the next fifteen years, with adverse impacts

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

		compared to A, as 9.6% fewer wells would be drilled.	compared to A, as 1.4% more wells would be drilled.	impact compared to A, as 2.7% more wells would be drilled.	compared to A, as 26.0% fewer wells would be drilled.	compared to A, as 1.4% less wells would be drilled.
Minerals and Energy Resources, Geophysical	Approximately 559 linear miles of source line would be conducted over the next fifteen years.	Approximately 507 linear miles of source line would be conducted over the next fifteen years, with long term, adverse impacts compared to A, as 10.4% fewer linear miles of source line would be conducted.	Approximately 573 linear miles of source line would be conducted over the next 15 years, with long term, beneficial impacts compared to A, as 1.9% more linear miles of source line would be conducted.	Approximately 585 linear miles of source line would be conducted over the next fifteen years, with long term, beneficial impacts compared to A, as 4.3% more linear miles of source line would be conducted.	Approximately 380 linear miles of source line would be conducted over the next fifteen years, with long term, adverse impacts compared to A, as 32.0% fewer linear miles of source line would be conducted.	Approximately 556 linear miles of source line would be conducted over the next fifteen years, with impacts similar to Alternative A..
Minerals and Energy Resources, Locatable	Approximately 1,675,057 acres (93.8% of BLM lands) would be open to mineral entry.	Approximately 1,527,656 acres would be open to mineral entry. This decision would result in an adverse impact compared to A, as 8.8% fewer acres would be open.	Approximately 1,682,865 acres would be open to mineral entry. This decision would result in a beneficial impact compared to A, as 0.5% more acres would be open.	Approximately 1,739,389 acres would be open to mineral entry. This decision would result in a beneficial impact compared to A, as 3.8% more acres would be open.	Approximately 1,015,384 acres would be open to mineral entry. This decision would result in an adverse impact compared to A, as 39.4% fewer acres would be open.	Approximately 1,734,458 acres would be open to mineral entry. This decision would result in a beneficial impact compared to A, as 3.4 % more acres would be open.
Minerals and Energy Resources, Salable	Approximately 1,389,256 acres (77.8% of BLM lands) would be open to mineral material disposal.	Approximately 1,241,906 acres would be open to mineral material disposal. This decision would result in an adverse impact compared to A, as 10.6% fewer acres would be open.	Approximately 1,358,968 acres would be open to mineral material disposal. This decision would result in an adverse impact compared to A, as 2.2% fewer acres would be open.	Approximately 1,383,277 acres would be open to mineral material disposal. This decision would result in an adverse impact compared to A, as 0.4% fewer acres would be open.	Approximately 758,931 acres would be open to mineral material disposal. This decision would result in an adverse impact compared to A, as 45.4% fewer acres would be open.	Approximately 1,348,968 acres would be open to mineral material disposal. This decision would result in an adverse impact compared to A, as 2.9 % fewer acres would be open.
Lands and Realty,	Long-term, adverse	Impacts same as	Impacts same as	Impacts same as	Impacts same as	Impacts same as

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

Recommendations for withdrawal from mineral entry	impacts on approximately 132,380 acres (7.4% of planning area) recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry.	Alternative A, except approximately 251,710 acres (14.0% of PA) would be recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry.	Alternative A, except approximately 121,912 acres (6.8% of PA) would be recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry.	Alternative A, except approximately 46,131 acres (2.6% of PA) would be recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry.	Alternative A, except approximately 834,070 acres (46.9% of PA) of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as exclusion areas for ROWs, which would have adverse impacts on mineral production and access for exploration.	Alternative A, except approximately 50,665 acres (2.8% of PA) would be recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry.
Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	No impacts to mineral and energy resources as non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics are not protected under this alternative.	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A	Adverse impacts from making approximately 582,357 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (or 32.6% of BLM lands) unavailable to mineral resource development.	Adverse impacts from making approximately 88,871 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (or 5.0% of BLM lands) unavailable to mineral resource development.
Recreation, San Juan River SRMA	Non-riparian areas in the 10,203-acre SRMA are open subject to Standard and Special Stipulations.	The entire 10,203-acre SRMA—not just riparian areas—would be subject to NSO. This decision results in an adverse impact compared to A.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Recreation, Cedar Mesa SRMA	The areas of the 375,734-acre CSRMA that are outside WSAs would be subject to Standard, Special, and NSO stipulations.	The areas of the 375,734-acre CSRMA outside WSAs would be subject to Standard and Special stipulations, with beneficial, long term impacts, compared to A.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Soil and Water	Long term, adverse	Same impacts as A,	Same as Alternative	Same impacts as A,	Same impacts as A,	Same impacts as A,

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

Resources, Sensitive Soils	impacts from a minimum of 1,063,019 acres of sensitive soils with medium and high limitations available for development, requiring BMPs and mitigation.	except a minimum of 1,049,158 acres of sensitive soils with medium and high limitations would be available for development.	A.	except a minimum of 1,069,495 acres of sensitive soils with medium and high limitations would be available for development.	except a minimum of 659,170 acres of sensitive soils with medium and high limitations would be available for development.	except a minimum of 1,063,652 acres of sensitive soils with medium and high limitations would be available for development.
Soil and Water Resources, Slopes over 20%	N/A	Long-term, adverse impacts from 21–40% steep slope and > 40% slopes requiring plans and/or no surface disturbances.	Impacts same as Alternative B, except >40% slopes would not allow surface disturbances unless project re-siting is problematic.	Long-term, adverse impacts from >40% slopes that would require a plan.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative C.
Special Designations, ACECs	Long-term, adverse impacts from approximately 119,397 acres (6.7% of planning area) closed or NSO due to ACEC designation.	Long-term, adverse impacts from approximately 87,567 acres (26.7% fewer acres of planning area than Alternative A) closed or NSO due to ACEC designation.	Long-term, adverse impacts from approximately 76,764 acres (35.7% fewer acres of planning area than Alternative A) closed or NSO due to ACEC designation.	Long-term, beneficial impacts to minerals as no acres would be closed or subject to NSO due to ACEC designation.	Long-term, adverse impacts from approximately 38,668 acres (67.6% fewer acres of planning area than Alternative A) closed or NSO due to ACEC designation.	Long-term, adverse impacts from approximately 74,429 acres (37.6% fewer acres of planning area than Alternative A) closed or NSO due to ACEC designation.
Special Designations, WSRs	N/A	Long-term, adverse impacts from Closed or NSO leasing on approximately 11,040 acres) due to WSR recommendations.	Long-term, adverse impacts from Closed or NSO leasing on approximately 3,968 acres due to WSR recommendations.	Long-term, beneficial impacts to minerals from no acres lands Closed or NSO due to WSR recommendations.	Same as Alternative B.	Long-term, adverse impacts from Closed or NSO leasing on approximately 6,736 acres) due to WSR recommendations
Wildlife,, Days that Limitations Are in Effect	Adverse impacts from limitations on speed and schedule for minerals activities for approximately 273 days of the year for seasonal restrictions.	Same as Alternative A.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except limitations would be in effect for approximately 243 days of the year.	Same as Alternative C.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative C.
Vegetation, Protection of Relict	Minor, adverse impacts from	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Long-term, beneficial impacts to minerals	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

and Near-relict Vegetation	protection of 662 acres of relict and near-relict vegetation.			from no protection of relict and near-relict vegetation.		
Visual Resources, VRM I Designation	Long-term, adverse impacts from designation of approximately 371,575 acres (20.9% of planning area) as VRM I, with surface disturbance limits on minerals activities.	Same as Alternative A, except approximately 497,668 acres (33.9%) would be designated as VRM I.	Same as Alternative A, except approximately 425,179 acres (14.4%) would be designated VRM I.	Same as Alternative A, except approximately 390,424 acres (5.1%) would be designated as VRM I.	Same as Alternative A, except approximately 998,370 acres (56.0%) would be designated as VRM I.	Same as Alternative A, except approximately 422,989 acres (24.0%) would be designated as VRM I.
NON-WSA LANDS WITH WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS						
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	No actions prescribed specifically for the protection non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	No actions prescribed specifically for the protection non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	No actions prescribed specifically for the protection non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	No actions prescribed specifically for the protection non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	582,360 acres in 29 non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed with emphasis on protection of wilderness characteristics	88,871 acres in 5 non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed with emphasis on protection of wilderness characteristics.
Minerals	470,590 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would remain open to leasing under standard or timing and controlled surface use stipulations. Up to 37 wells could be drilled over the next 15 years disturbing 355 acres.	485,010 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would remain open to leasing under standard or timing and controlled surface use stipulations. Up to 38 wells could be drilled over the next 15 years disturbing 365 acres.	548,350 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would remain open to leasing under standard or timing and controlled surface use stipulations. Up to 39 wells could be drilled over the next 15 years disturbing 374 acres.	582,360 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would remain open to leasing under standard or timing and controlled surface use stipulations. Up to 37 wells could be drilled over the next 15 years disturbing 355 acres.	All 582,360 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be closed to leasing. However, 4,440 acres are currently exist in 10 of the non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, and would allow for development. Possibility of development in the Monument Upwarp development area.	460,093 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would remain open to leasing under standard or timing and controlled surface use stipulations. Up to 39 wells could be drilled over the next 15 years disturbing 374 acres.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

					Generally, the wilderness characteristics of all non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be protect.	
Visual Resources	262,340 acres in all or parts of 25 non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed by VRM Class I and Class II objectives, limiting surface disturbance and protecting the natural characteristics of the areas.	219,267 acres in all or parts of 23 non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed by VRM Class I and Class II objectives, limiting surface disturbance and protecting the natural characteristics of the areas.	125,370 acres in all or parts of 20 non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed by VRM Class I and Class II objectives, limiting surface disturbance and protecting the natural characteristics of the areas.	6,350 acres in parts of 4 non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed by VRM Class I and Class II objectives, limiting surface disturbance and protecting the natural characteristics of the areas.	582,360 acres in all of 29 non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed by VRM Class I objectives, limiting surface disturbance and protecting the natural characteristics of the areas.	195,205 acres in all or parts of 20 non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed by VRM Class I and Class II objectives, limiting surface disturbance and protecting the natural characteristics of the areas.
Travel Management	140,600 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be "open" to cross country motorized travel, resulting in potential surface disturbance and degradation of the natural characteristics of these areas. 388,390 acres "limited" to 410 miles of designated routes. The presence and noise of vehicle use would diminish opportunities for solitude and conflict with primitive	547,290 acres "limited" to 258 miles of designated routes. The presence and noise of vehicle use would diminish opportunities for solitude and conflict with primitive recreation activities. 35,070 acres "closed" to motorized vehicle use, protecting the natural characteristics and opportunities for solitude and primitive recreation.	552,960 acres "limited" to 348 miles of designated routes. The presence and noise of vehicle use would diminish opportunities for solitude and conflict with primitive recreation activities. 29,400 acres "closed" to motorized vehicle use, protecting the natural characteristics and opportunities for solitude and primitive recreation.	20 acres in Indian Creek non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be "open" to cross country travel with impacts as described under Alternative A. 582,340 acres "limited" to 410 miles of designated routes. The presence and noise of vehicle use would diminish opportunities for solitude and conflict with primitive recreation activities.	582,360 acres "closed" to motorized vehicle use, protecting the natural characteristics and opportunities for solitude and primitive recreation.	88,871 acres "limited" to 175 miles of designated routes in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics managed to protect those characteristics. 488,891 acres "limited" to 173 miles in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics managed for other resource values and uses. The presence and noise of vehicle use would diminish opportunities for solitude and conflict with primitive recreation activities.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	recreation activities. 53,370 acres “closed” to motorized vehicle use, protecting the natural characteristics and opportunities for solitude and primitive recreation.					4,598 acres “closed” to motorized vehicle use in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics managed for other resource values and use, protecting the natural characteristics and opportunities for solitude and primitive recreation.
Woodlands	Wood cutting prohibited on 361,616 acres in all or portions of 24 non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics protecting the natural characteristics of the areas by preventing surface disturbance associated with wood cutting. Wood cutting permitted on 220,744 acres, degrading the natural characteristics of the affected non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics and opportunities for both solitude and primitive recreation.	Wood cutting prohibited on 387,090 acres in all or portions of 24 non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics protecting the natural characteristics of the areas by preventing surface disturbance associated with wood cutting. Wood cutting permitted on 195,270 acres, degrading the natural characteristics of the affected non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics and opportunities for both solitude and primitive recreation.	Wood cutting prohibited on 350,380 acres in all or portions of 24 non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics protecting the natural characteristics of the areas by preventing surface disturbance associated with wood cutting. Wood cutting permitted on 231,980 acres, degrading the natural characteristics of the affected non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics and opportunities for both solitude and primitive recreation.	Wood cutting prohibited on 363,706 acres in all or portions of 24 non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics protecting the natural characteristics of the areas by preventing surface disturbance associated with wood cutting. Wood cutting permitted on 218,654 acres, degrading the natural characteristics of the affected non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics and opportunities for both solitude and primitive recreation.	Wood cutting prohibited on 582,360 acres in all 24 non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics protecting the natural characteristics of the areas by preventing surface disturbance associated with wood cutting. Without presence and noise of people, vehicles, and chainsaws, opportunities for both solitude and primitive recreation would be protected.	Wood cutting prohibited on 88,871 acres in 5 non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics managed to protect those characteristics. 274,835 acres in all or portions of 24 non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics managed for other resource values and uses would also be closed. Closing areas to wood cutting would protect the natural characteristics of the areas by preventing surface disturbance associated with wood cutting. Wood cutting permitted on 218,654 acres, degrading the natural characteristics of the affected non-WSA lands with

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

						wilderness characteristics and opportunities for both solitude and primitive recreation.
Special Designations	Designation of 7 ACECs and the recommendation of 2 segments for WSR designation would provide protection of the wilderness characteristics of 22 non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	Designation of 10 ACECs and the recommendation of 3 segments for WSR designation would provide protection of the wilderness characteristics of 15 non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	Designation of 5 ACECs and the recommendation of a segment for WSR designation would provide protection of the wilderness characteristics of 8 non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	No ACECs would be designated and no WSRs would be recommended, offering no additional protection of the wilderness characteristics of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	Same as Alternative B.	Same of Alternative C.
PALEONTOLOGY						
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Lands and Realty	Adverse impacts from increased public access and surface-disturbing activities, and beneficial impacts from land acquisition and stewardship. No specified restrictions on land-use authorizations.	Impacts same as those described in Alternative A, with more acres excluded from land-use authorizations.	Impacts same as those described in Alternative A, with more acres excluded from land-use authorizations.	Impacts same as those described in Alternative A, with more acres excluded from land-use authorizations.	Impacts same as those described in Alternative A, with more acres excluded from land-use authorizations than any of the alternatives.	Impacts same as those described in Alternative A, with more acres excluded from land-use authorizations.
Livestock Grazing	Adverse impacts from livestock trampling causing damage or destruction of surface fossils. Highest potential for impacts due to least acres unavailable for livestock grazing. Would manage 128,098 acres as	Adverse impacts and restrictions same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree with an additional 13,062 acres unavailable to livestock grazing..	Adverse impacts and restrictions same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree with an additional 8,163 acres unavailable to livestock grazing.	Adverse impacts and restrictions same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree with an additional 4,010 acres unavailable to livestock grazing.	Same as Alternative B.	Adverse impacts and restrictions same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree with an additional 13,718 acres unavailable to livestock grazing.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	unavailable to grazing.					
Minerals and Energy Resources	Adverse impacts from damage or destruction of Paleontological resources from surface disturbance, particularly in Class 3, 4/5, and 5 lands. Lands open to minerals development would include 865,559 acres of Class 3, 4/5, and 5 paleontologically sensitive geologic units.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a somewhat greater degree due to 20,111 more acres of Class 3, 4/5, and 5 lands open to minerals development than under Alternative A.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree due to 87,911 more acres of Class 3, 4/5, and 5 lands open to minerals development than under Alternative A.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree due to 120,747 more acres of Class 3, 4/5, and 5 lands open to minerals development than under Alternative A.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree due to 98,299 less acres of Class 3, 4/5, and 5 lands open to minerals development than under Alternative A.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree due to 459,995 more acres of Class 3, 4/5, and 5 lands open to minerals development than under Alternative A.
Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	No impacts to paleontological resources, as non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would not be protected under this alternative.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Surface disturbance restrictions on 582,357 acres to protect non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would have greater beneficial impacts on sensitive resources than under Alternative A.	Same as Alternative E, except 88,871 acres would be managed to protect non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.
Recreation	Adverse impacts include damage or destruction of important surface fossils from motorized vehicles, illegal collection, and vandalism. Beneficial impacts from regulated recreational use and awareness programs. This	Impacts same as Alternative A with lower potential for adverse impacts and more potential beneficial impacts due to increased restrictions on recreational activities.	Impacts same as Alternative A, with lower potential for adverse impacts and more potential beneficial impacts due to increased restrictions on recreational activities.	Impacts same as Alternative A, with lower potential for adverse impacts and more potential beneficial impacts due to a high number of restrictions on recreational activities.	Impacts same as Alternative A, with the lowest potential for adverse impacts due to increased restrictions on recreational activities and surface disturbance compared to the other alternatives.	Impacts same as Alternative A, with lower potential for adverse impacts and more potential beneficial impacts due to a high number of restrictions on recreational activities.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	alternative would provide the fewest restrictions on recreational activities.					
Special Designations	Potential adverse impacts include increased public access, unlawful collection or vandalism of sensitive resources, increased vehicle access, and surface-disturbing actions. Potential beneficial impacts from restrictions on public access and surface-disturbing activities. Alternative A would have limited restrictions on both commercial and recreational access. Additionally, 171,736 acres of Class 3 units, 141,790 acres of Class 4/5 units, and 93,985 acres of Class 5 units would lie within ACECs	Potential impacts same as Alternative A, but with greater beneficial impacts from increased restrictions on access to sensitive paleontological resources compared to Alternative A including 68,427 more acres in ACECs as Class 3, 4/5, and 5 units.	Potential impacts same as Alternative A, but with greater restrictions on surface-disturbing actions, and commercial and recreational access than Alternative A including 343,141 fewer acres in ACECs as Class 3, 4/5, and 5 units.	Potential impacts same as Alternative A, but with somewhat greater restrictions on surface-disturbing actions, and commercial and recreational access than Alternative A, including zero acres in ACECs as Class 3, 4/5, and 5 units.	Potential impacts same as Alternative A, but with the greatest beneficial restrictions on access and surface-disturbing actions of any of the alternatives.	Same as Alternative C.
Travel Management	Potentially adverse, direct and indirect impacts from surface-disturbing actions, and increased public access resulting in unlawful collection, vandalism, or destruction of sensitive resources. Alternative A would	Potential impacts same as Alternative A, but to lesser degree due to greater restrictions on travel and public access compared to Alternative A with 147,268 more acres closed to OHV use.	Potential impacts same as Alternative A, but to lesser degree due to greater restrictions on travel and public access compared to Alternative A with 142,237 more acres closed to OHV use.	Potential impacts same as Alternative A, but with zero acres closed to OHV use.	Potential impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree due to the greatest level of restrictions on travel and public access compared to Alternative A with 694,005 more acres closed to OHV use.	Potential impacts same as Alternative A, but to lesser degree due to greater restrictions on travel and public access compared to Alternative A with 117,465 more acres closed to OHV use.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	open the most acreage to travel and public access.					
Woodlands	Adverse impacts include surface disturbance during harvest and road construction, and increased OHV access and access to sensitive resources. There would be limited restrictions on woodlands harvesting under Alternative A with the potential impacts on 662,223 acres of Class 3, 4/5, and 5 units.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree due to greater seasonal restrictions, limits and closures for woodland harvesting. Potential impacts on 254,712 fewer acres of Class 3, 4/5, and 5 units than Alternative A.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree due to increased seasonal restrictions, limits and closures for woodland harvesting. Potential impacts on 167,389 fewer acres of Class 3, 4/5, and 5 units than Alternative A.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to somewhat lesser degree from seasonal restrictions, limits, and closures to woodland harvesting. Potential impacts on fewer acres than Alternative A, but greater impacts than the other alternatives.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to lesser degree than any of the alternatives due to limited acreage available for harvesting, and restrictions on surface disturbance to protect wilderness characteristics.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree due to increased seasonal restrictions, limits and closures for woodland harvesting. Potential impacts on 167,388 fewer acres of Class 3, 4/5, and 5 units than Alternative A.
RECREATION						
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Air Quality	Long-term, beneficial impacts on recreation-related scenic quality from management decisions that would limit smoke, haze, and other pollutants.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Cultural Resources	Long-term, substantially adverse impacts to recreation resources in Comb Ridge, Tank Bench, and Beef Basin from lack of restrictions. Long-term, adverse impacts to recreation from access	Long-term, beneficial impacts to recreation resources in the Comb Ridge, Tank Bench, Beef Basin, and McLoyd Canyon-Moon House CSMA, in Grand Gulch Historic District from decisions to prevent resource degradation,	Management action impacts for Comb Ridge, Tank Bench, Beef Basin, and McLoyd Canyon-Moon House same as Alternative B.	Short term, beneficial impacts from reduced restrictions from not managing Comb Ridge, Tank Bench, and, Beef Basin as CSMA, but long term, adverse impacts on resource and users from	Same as Alternative B, except more beneficial impacts from surface disturbance restrictions in 18,514 (39%) in Comb Ridge CSMA from protection of non-WSA wilderness characteristics areas.	Same as Alternative B, except Comb Ridge, Beef Basin, and McLoyd Canyon-Moon House managed as zones within Cedar Mesa SRMA, for cultural/recreation resource protection.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	restrictions to the McLoyd Canyon-Moon House. Managing the Grand Gulch Historic District for primitive recreation would have beneficial impacts on non-mechanized or specialized users, and adverse impacts on other user groups.	and from management under SRMA plans. Impacts to user groups would be variable (see Recreation section in text for analysis of impacts to user groups).		conflicts and user degradation. Impacts to McLoyd Canyon-Moon House same as Alternative B. Impacts to Grand Gulch Historic District same as Alternative C.		
Fire Management	Short-term, adverse impacts on all recreational user groups from loss of recreation opportunities in treated areas. Long-term, beneficial impacts from reduced risk of fire, improved wildlife habitat and vegetation (with greater opportunities for wildlife viewing).	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Health and Safety	Short-term health and safety risks to recreational users in those areas where hiking, OHV use, and target shooting are in close proximity to hazardous materials and AML sites. Reclamation of AML mine sites would beneficially expand recreational opportunities in the	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	long-term.					
Lands and Realty	Short-term, beneficial impacts on non-mechanized, specialized, river floating, and mountain biking users from prohibitions on pyrotechnics and explosives use during filming. Long-term, beneficial impacts from protection of natural resources for recreation during filming.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Livestock Grazing	Long-term, beneficial impacts on recreation resources and non-mechanized users from areas unavailable for livestock grazing. Negligible impacts on other recreation resource users.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Minerals and Energy Resources	Impacts on recreation resources would be minor, but adverse because of potential scenic quality degradation from predicted 73 wells and a total of 2,436 acres of disturbance caused by oil and gas, geophysical, salable, locatable minerals activities (0.14% of the FO).	Same as Alternative A, except that 66 wells predicted with total surface disturbances of 2,281 acres from all minerals activities (0.13% of the FO).	Same as Alternative A, except that 74 wells predicted with total surface disturbances of 2,4641 acres from all minerals activities (0.14% of the FO).	Same as Alternative A, except that 75 wells predicted with total surface disturbances of 2,496 acres from all minerals activities (0.14% of the FO).	Same as Alternative A, except that 54 wells predicted with total surface disturbances of 2,131 acres from all minerals activities (0.13% of the FO). Reduced impacts from an additional 582,360 acres protected from minerals-related surface disturbances within areas with non-WSA wilderness	Same as Alternative E, except that 72 wells predicted with total surface disturbances of 2,446 acres from all minerals activities (0.13% of the FO), with 88,871 acres protected from minerals-related surface disturbances within areas with non-WSA wilderness

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

					characteristics.	characteristics.
Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	Negligible impacts to recreation resources and uses as non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics are not protected under this alternative.	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A	Long-term, beneficial impacts on recreation resources and opportunities for non-mechanized, motorized, scenic driving, and mountain biking groups from preservation of 165,831 acres for non-WSA wilderness characteristics within the SRMAs, and 491,628 acres within the ERMA. Long-term, adverse impacts on competitive, motorized and mountain biking events in these areas.	Long-term, beneficial impacts on recreation resources and opportunities for non-mechanized, and OHV users from protection of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics within 13,600 acres in SRMAs, and allowed OHV use.
Paleontology	Paleontological management decisions would have negligible impacts on recreation.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Recreation	San Juan River SRMA Short-term, beneficial impacts from timing stipulations and reserved campsites along river in the 15,100-acre SRMA. Long-term, adverse impacts from lack of resource protection and continued intense river use, and motorized boating.	San Juan River SRMA Long-term, beneficial impacts on river experience from reduced crowding by reducing commercial use (beneficial impacts on private users, adverse impacts on commercial users), from limited vehicle camping, from additional campsites	San Juan River SRMA Commercial floating, vehicle camping impacts as under Alternative B. Vehicle camping, impacts as under B. Motorized boating impacts as under A. Adverse impacts from 33% reduction in SRMA, compared to the No Action (9,859-acre SRMA under	San Juan River SRMA Impacts same as Alternative A for river users. Designated camping impacts as under Alternative B. Adverse impacts from 58% reduction in SRMA size (6,365-acre SRMA under Alternative D).	San Juan River SRMA Same as Alternative B, except that 4,124 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics lie within the proposed SRMA, which would beneficially increase protection of resources and benefit non-mechanized river users.	Same as Alternative C.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

		on Navajo Reservation (subject to MOU). Limited camping would have adverse impacts on non-river-floating users. An adverse reduction in size of the SRMA by 30% compared to the No Action (10,203-acre SRMA under Alternative B).	Alternative C).			
	Cedar Mesa (Grand Gulch Plateau) SRMA Long-term, beneficial impacts on resources and non-mechanized users in the 385,000-acre Grand Gulch SRMA from designated campsites, pet controls, no campfires, limited group size.	Cedar Mesa C-SRMA (375,739 acres) Same as Alternative A, except managed as 375,739-acre Cedar Mesa Cultural SRMA, pets excluded from specified areas, no woodland harvesting or collecting. Long-term, beneficial impacts from permitted camping and day use.	Cedar Mesa C-SRMA (375,739 acres) Same impacts as Alternative B, except pet control would be same as A. Short-term adverse impacts to stock users, but long-term benefits from resource preservation.	Cedar Mesa C-SRMA (375,739 acres) Management decisions and impacts same as Alternative C, except that pets and stock would be prohibited or limited if causing adverse impacts to recreation resources.	Cedar Mesa C-SRMA (375,739 acres) Same as Alternative B, except 109,700 acres (29%) within the proposed C-SRMA would be protected for preservation of non-WSA wilderness characteristics, with benefits to non-mechanized users and adverse impacts to mechanized users in this area.	Cedar Mesa SRMA (407,098 acres) Same as Alternative B, except 13,600 acres in SRMA manage for protection of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, benefiting non-mechanized and mechanized users.
	Dark Canyon SRMA Managed under the 214,390-acre Canyon Basin SRMA. Long-term, adverse impacts to resources from unlimited group sizes, dogs and vehicles, dispersed camping, campfires, and minimal ranger presence. Long-term,	Dark Canyon SRMA (30,820 acres) Short- and long-term, beneficial impacts on resources from limits on users per day, designated campsites, limits on campfires (mesa tops), waste management, pet restrictions, and	Dark Canyon SRMA (30,820 acres) Impacts same as Alternative B, but decreased long-term, beneficial impacts by increased group size and numbers.	Dark Canyon SRMA (30,820 acres) Impacts same as Alternative A from unrestricted dispersed camping, permitted large and numerous commercial groups, unrestricted use of campfires, no designated	Dark Canyon SRMA (30,820 acres) Same as Alternative B, except for additional beneficial impacts from protection of 2,522 acres (8%) to preserve non-WSA wilderness characteristics.	Dark Canyon SRMA (30,820 acres) Same as Alternative C.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	adverse impacts to users from over-crowding, user conflicts, loss of recreational opportunities.	prohibitions on firewood collecting. Short-term, adverse impacts on users from group size and number limits, but long-term, beneficial impacts from improved backcountry opportunities.		campsites, and unrestricted firewood collection.		
	Indian Creek SRMA Managed as part of the 214,390-acre Canyon Basins SRMA. Long-term, adverse impacts on resources and resource users from unlimited, unrestricted user group sizes, minimal monitoring of surface disturbances, unrestricted camping and use of campfires, potential degradation of cultural-recreational resources, and unrestricted presence of pets.	Indian Creek SRMA (89,721 acres) Short- and long-term, beneficial impacts on resources from designated camping, prohibitions on dispersed camping, prohibitions on wood gathering, and adaptive management to preserve resources. Short-term, beneficial impacts on resource users from additional recreational facilities. Long-term, beneficial impacts on users from management decisions that address the increasing popularity and recreational use of the area.	Indian Creek SRMA (89,721 acres) Same as Alternative B.	Indian Creek SRMA (89,721 acres) Same as Alternative B.	Indian Creek SRMA (89,721 acres) Same as Alternative B, except 47,393 acres in SRMA managed for protection of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, with beneficial impacts on non-mechanized users and adverse impacts on OHV and mountain biking users.	Indian Creek SRMA (89,721 acres) Same as Alternative C.
	White Canyon SRMA Area not managed as an SRMA. Long-term, adverse impacts from unrestricted private	White Canyon SRMA (2,828 acres) Short-term and long-term, beneficial impacts from fire pan	White Canyon SRMA (2,828 acres) Same as Alternative B.	White Canyon SRMA (2,828 acres) Long-term, adverse impacts from lack of permit system to limit	White Canyon SRMA (2,828 acres) Same as Alternative B, except 2,092 acres would be managed for	White Canyon SRMA (2,828 acres) Same as Alternative B.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	and commercial use, open camping and campfires.	use, permit system, primitive campground development, prohibitions on campfires in-canyon.		resource use and visitation. Long-term, beneficial impacts from developed campsites, fire pan use.	protection of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (this management would not change level of beneficial impacts).	
	ERMA No specified management decisions. Long-term, beneficial impacts to resources and users from adaptive management to protect resources.	ERMA Long-term, beneficial impacts from adaptive management, limits on dispersed vehicle camping, camping limited to designated sites along Bears Ears Road and Deer Flat Road, and coordination with Glen Canyon Rec Area on campground construction.	ERMA Same as Alternative B, except allowing dispersed vehicle camping within 150 of roadways would have long-term, adverse impacts on resources from surface disturbances.	ERMA Same as Alternative C, except that dispersed vehicle camping allowed within 300 feet of roadways.	ERMA Same as Alternative B, except 416,526 acres management for protection of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics in the ERMA would have more beneficial impacts on non-mechanized users and more adverse impacts on mechanized users.	ERMA Same as Alternative B, except dispersed camping allowed within 150 feet of road. Management of 75,271 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics in the ERMA would have beneficial impacts on mechanized and non-mechanized users.
	Special Recreation Permits (SRPs) Long-term, beneficial impacts from stipulations in the permit that would ensure that resources were not adversely impacts.	Special Recreation Permits (SRPs) Same as Alternative A.	Special Recreation Permits (SRPs) Same as Alternative A.	Special Recreation Permits (SRPs) Same as Alternative A.	Special Recreation Permits (SRPs) Same as Alternative B, but reduced beneficial impacts from fewer opportunities for commercial, specialized recreation in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	Special Recreation Permits (SRPs) Same as Alternative A.
Riparian Resources	No specific management decisions would affect recreation, but current adverse impacts would have long-term recreation opportunity-degrading impacts on hiking, trail	Riparian management decisions would have long-term, beneficial impacts on recreation by excluding livestock in specified riparian areas, closing areas to OHV use, and	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	use, wildlife viewing, sightseeing, and camping.	closing functioning at risk areas to motorized camping. Short-term, adverse impacts on recreational opportunities until riparian area were restored.				
Soil and Water Resources	Soils and watershed management decisions are unspecified, but impacts on recreation would be negligible.	No specific management action impacts on recreation, but erosion control planning and mitigation on steep slopes would have long-term, beneficial impacts on recreation-related scenic quality.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Special Designations	Alkali Ridge ACEC (39,202 acres) Beneficial, long-term impacts from resource preservation and/or mitigation of disturbances.	Alkali Ridge ACEC (39,196 acres) Long-term, beneficial impacts from cultural resource management plan, and prohibitions on surface-disturbing activities that might threaten the area's cultural resources.	Alkali Ridge ACEC (39,196 acres) Same as Alternative A, except that a management plan would be prepared and limits placed on surface disturbances, which would have beneficial impacts on recreation.	Alkali Ridge ACEC Not designated as an ACEC. The impacts would be adverse in the long-term because surface disturbances would not be limited, visual quality would be adversely affected and adverse for sightseeing opportunities.	Alkali Ridge ACEC (39,196 acres) Same as Alternative B.	Alkali Ridge ACEC (39,196 acres) Same as Alternative C.
	Bridger Jack Mesa ACEC (6,260 acres) Long-term, beneficial, impacts on recreation resources and non-mechanized users.	Bridger Jack Mesa ACEC (6,225 acres) Same as Alternative A.	Bridger Jack Mesa ACEC Impacts to the area would be the same as Alternative A because the area lies within a	Bridger Jack Mesa ACEC Same as Alternative C.	Bridger Jack Mesa ACEC (6,225 acres) Same as Alternative A.	Bridger Jack Mesa ACEC Same as Alternative C.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	Long-term, adverse impacts on motorized OHV, mountain biking, specialized, and scenic driving user groups within the ACEC because it lies within a WSA.		WSA; but the area would not be designated as an ACEC.			
	Butler Wash North ACEC (17,464 acres) Long-term, beneficial impacts on non-mechanized users from maintenance of wilderness values, but long term adverse impacts on mechanized and specialized users from prohibitions on surface disturbances because the ACEC lies within a WSA.	Butler Wash North ACEC (17,365 acres) Same as Alternative A.	Butler Wash North ACEC Impacts to the area would be the same as Alternative A because the area lies within a WSA; but the area would not be designated as an ACEC.	Butler Wash North ACEC Same as Alternative C.	Butler Wash North ACEC (17,365 acres) Same as Alternative B.	Butler Wash North ACEC Same as Alternative C.
	Cedar Mesa ACEC (295,336 acres) Short-term, adverse impacts from rangeland and wildlife improvement projects, and fire suppression. Long-term, adverse impacts from potential minerals resource exploration and development. Long-term, beneficial impacts from designated OHV use, protection of cultural resources, and areas	Cedar Mesa ACEC (306,742 acres) Long-term, beneficial impacts from waste management, prohibitions on dispersed camping, and limiting day use and overnight camping to protect cultural resources. Long-term, adverse impacts on recreation users from reduced recreational opportunities.	Cedar Mesa ACEC Long-term beneficial impacts same as Alternative B from management as a 375,739-acre SRMA, but the area would not be designated as an ACEC. Long-term adverse impacts same as Alternative B, but to a lesser degree, because the area would be open to dispersed camping opportunities.	Cedar Mesa ACEC Same as Alternative C.	Cedar Mesa ACEC (306,742 acres) Same impacts as Alternative B, but more beneficial to non-mechanized recreation, from protection of 60,049 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics within the ACEC.	Cedar Mesa ACEC Same as Alternative C.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	managed for scenic quality and non-motorized uses.					
	Dark Canyon ACEC (61,660 acres) Dark Canyon lies entirely within a WSA, so there would be long-term, beneficial impacts on non-mechanized users from maintenance of wilderness values, but long term adverse impacts on mechanized and specialized users from prohibitions on surface disturbances.	Dark Canyon ACEC (61,660 acres) Same as Alternative A.	Dark Canyon ACEC Impacts to the area would be the same as Alternative A because the area lies within a WSA; but the area would not be designated as an ACEC.	Dark Canyon ACEC Same as Alternative C.	Dark Canyon ACEC (61,660 acres) Same as Alternative A.	Dark Canyon ACEC (61,660 acres) Same as Alternative C.
	Hovenweep ACEC (1,798 acres) Impacts would be similar to Cedar Mesa ACEC. Beneficial opportunities for mechanized recreation, wildlife viewing, and cultural interpretation. Long term, adverse impacts from minerals development on sightseeing opportunities, cultural, and wildlife viewing.	Hovenweep ACEC (2,439 acres) Same as Alternative A.	Hovenweep ACEC (2,439 acres) Same as Alternative B.	Hovenweep ACEC The ACEC would not be established. Adverse impact to recreation in the short- and long-term from minerals development, watershed and vegetation treatment projects, impacts to cultural resources. Long-term, beneficial impacts for OHV users and non-motorized trail users. Adverse impacts on users seeking remoteness, solitude, and naturalness.	Hovenweep ACEC (2,439 acres) Same as Alternative B.	Hovenweep ACEC (2,439 acres) Same as Alternative A.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	Indian Creek ACEC (8,510 acres) Managed to protect visual quality, management decisions would permit minimal surface disturbances and closed to OHV use, with long-term, beneficial impacts on recreation resources. Variable impacts on recreation users: beneficial impacts on non-mechanized and scenic drivers; adverse impacts on mechanized users from limited recreational opportunities.	Indian Creek ACEC (8,510 acres) Same impacts as Alternative A.	Indian Creek ACEC (3,908 acres) Same impacts as Alternative B on recreation resources, but reduced degree of beneficial impacts on resources and users because the ACEC would be reduced in area by 46% in comparison to Alternative A. This alternative would beneficially increase opportunities for OHV use along designated trails and routes in the ACEC. The reduced size of the ACEC would likely create user conflicts between mechanized and non-mechanized users.	Indian Creek ACEC The ACEC would not be established, with no emphasis on managing the area for scenic quality except those areas that lie within WSAs. Adverse, long-term impacts on recreation resources that lie outside of WSAs from lack of resource protection. Variable impacts on resource users: non-mechanized and scenic drivers would be adversely impacted; mechanized, specialized users would benefit in the short-term. Long-term, adverse impacts on all users from user conflicts, resource degradation, and crowding.	Indian Creek ACEC (8,510 acres) Same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree, because, 30% of the ACEC (3,887 acres) would be protected to preserve lands with non-WSA wilderness characteristics: more adverse impacts to mechanized users from OHV prohibitions; more beneficial impacts to non-mechanized users from increased opportunities for solitude, remoteness.	Indian Creek ACEC (3,908 acres) Same impacts as Alternative A for non-mechanized recreation, but same as Alternative C for mechanized uses, for impacts from resource use conflicts within the smaller ACEC.
	Lockhart Basin ACEC The area would not be managed as an ACEC. Long-term, beneficial impacts on recreation resources from VRM I designation, prohibitions on woodcutting and OHV	Lockhart Basin ACEC (47,783 acres) Long term, beneficial impacts to resources and to non-mechanized users from maintained high scenic quality as VRM Class I, and adverse impacts on mechanized users	Lockhart Basin ACEC Not designated as an ACEC, and managed as VRM Class II and VRM Class III. Adverse impacts to recreation resources because the area would be open to mineral leasing,	Lockhart Basin ACEC Same as Alternative C.	Lockhart Basin ACEC (47,783 acres) Same as Alternative B, except to a greater beneficial degree for non-mechanized users and greater adverse impacts to motorized OHV users, from management of 45% of the ACEC (21,298	Lockhart Basin ACEC Same as Alternative C.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	use in the Indian Creek ACEC (6,870 acres) and WSA portions of the basin. Long-term, adverse impacts on OHV users, but beneficial impacts on scenic drivers, non-motorized, and non-mechanized users. Long term, adverse impacts to non-mechanized users outside of the ACEC/WSA areas within the basin from reduced opportunities for solitude, remoteness, and quiet.	from limited opportunities.	livestock grazing in VRM III areas. Long-term, adverse impacts to all recreation groups from degradation of scenic quality in VRM Class III areas. Short-term, beneficial impacts to OHV users, but long-term, adverse impacts from resource degradation in VRM III areas.		acres) for preservation of lands with non-WSA wilderness characteristics.	
	Lavender Mesa ACEC (649 acres) Long-term, beneficial impacts on recreation resources from protection of visual, cultural, and natural resources. Negligible impacts on mechanized recreation users because the area is inaccessible. Beneficial impacts on non-mechanized and specialized users (climbers) from preservation of an undeveloped recreation area.	Lavender Mesa ACEC (649 acres) Same as Alternative A.	Lavender Mesa ACEC (649 acres) Same as Alternative A.	Lavender Mesa ACEC The ACEC would not be established. Long-term, adverse impacts to recreation resources from unrestricted surface-disturbing activities. Long-term, adverse impacts on non-mechanized and specialized users from lack of protection-related management decisions that would allow resource degradation.	Lavender Mesa ACEC (649 acres) Same as Alternative A., except the area would also be managed for protection of its non-WSA wilderness characteristics.	Lavender Mesa ACEC (649 acres) Same as Alternative C.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	Scenic Highway Corridor ACEC (70,017 acres) Long term, beneficial impacts to scenic drivers and scenic quality preservation along the motor routes within the ACEC. Long term, adverse impacts to OHV and mountain bikers from limited opportunities along the corridor.	Scenic Highway Corridor ACEC Under this alternative the ACEC would not be designated, with long term, beneficial impacts from reduced restrictions on activities within the corridor.	Scenic Highway Corridor ACEC Same as Alternative B.	Scenic Highway Corridor ACEC Same as Alternative B.	Scenic Highway Corridor ACEC Same as Alternative B.	Scenic Highway Corridor ACEC Same as Alternative B.
	Shay Canyon ACEC (3,561 acres) Minor impacts on resources from actions that limit OHV use, protect scenic quality (as VRM Class I), and from protection of cultural resources. Minor impacts on resource users because opportunities would be available for mechanized and non-mechanized users.	Shay Canyon ACEC (119 acres) The ACEC would be managed as a 119-acre area to conserve cultural resources. Impacts on recreation resource would be beneficial in the long-term because surface disturbances would be prohibited. Impacts on all recreation use would be adverse in the long-term from limitations imposed to protect cultural resources, and from a substantial reduction of ACEC area that would limit and constrain recreational opportunities.	Shay Canyon ACEC (119 acres) Same as Alternative B.	Shay Canyon ACEC The ACEC would not be established. Managed under VRM Class III objectives, limited OHV use, livestock grazing, fuels and watershed treatments that would have long-term, adverse impacts on resources. Short-term, beneficial impacts on mechanized and non-mechanized users from expanded opportunities, but long-term, adverse impacts on users from resource degradation through lack of protection	Shay Canyon ACEC (119 acres) Same as Alternative B, except that 99 acres (83% of the ACEC) would be managed for protection of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. Reduced adverse impacts from prohibitions on OHV, which be better able to accommodate allowed recreational activities in the small area.	Shay Canyon ACEC (119 acres) Same as Alternative B.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

				prescriptions.		
	San Juan River ACEC The area would not be designated as an ACEC, but impacts would be the same as the San Juan River SRMA impacts (described above) because the area would continue to be managed as the San Juan River SRMA (15,100 acres).	San Juan River ACEC (7,590 acres) Long-term, beneficial impacts on resources from decisions that limit or restrict surface disturbances. Long-term, adverse impacts on motorized, mountain biking, non-mechanized users from reduced recreational opportunities. Negligible impacts on river users.	San Juan River ACEC (7,590 acres) Same as Alternative B.	San Juan River ACEC The ACEC would not be designated, but impacts would be same as Alternative B because of similar management decisions to protect recreational resources and allow similar range of recreational opportunities.	San Juan River ACEC (7,590 acres) Same as Alternative B, except 2,155 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (28% of the ACEC) would be managed to limit surface disturbances.	San Juan River ACEC (4,321 acres) Same as Alternative B.
	Valley of the Gods ACEC The 31,387-acre area would not be designated an ACEC, but continued to be managed as a Special Emphasis Area within the Cedar Mesa ACEC. Long term, beneficial impacts through limitations on surface disturbances, and management under VRM I objectives. Long-term, beneficial impacts on non-mechanized, mechanized, and scenic drivers because opportunities would be available.	Valley of the Gods ACEC (22,863 acres) Impacts would be same as A because of VRM I objectives for the area.	Valley of the Gods ACEC (22,863 acres) Same as Alternative B.	Valley of the Gods ACEC No designation as an ACEC. VRM III management objectives would allow long-term, adverse impacts to resources, with long-term, adverse impacts to scenic drivers, non-motorized, and non-mechanized users from diminished recreational opportunities.	Valley of the Gods ACEC (22,863 acres) Same as Alternative B, except 20,743 acres in ACEC (91% of ACEC) managed for protection of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	Valley of the Gods ACEC (22,863 acres) Same as Alternative B.
	WSR Colorado	WSR Colorado	WSR Colorado	WSR Colorado	WSR Colorado	WSR Colorado

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	Segments Impacts on segment #1 would be beneficial in the long-term from restrictions to preserve ORVs, with beneficial, long-term impacts on all users because opportunities would continue to be available. Impacts on Segment #2 and #3 would be the same as for #1 above.	Segments Impacts on segment #1 would be beneficial in the long-term from preservation of ORVs. Impacts on specialized, mountain biking, non-mechanized, river users, and motorized users would be beneficial because opportunities would be available for recreation. Potential adverse impacts from resource use conflicts within the narrow river segment. Impacts on Segment #2 would be same as #1 above. Impact to Segment #3 would have long-term, beneficial impacts on resources and non-mechanized users, but long-term, adverse impacts on mountain biking and motorized users from reduced opportunities.	Segments Recommended as not suitable, the impacts on segment #1 resources and users would be adverse in the long-term from reduced protection from surface disturbances. Impacts to Segment #2 would be same as Alternative B, except that motorized use would create user conflicts and diminish the non-mechanized user experience. Impacts to Segment #3 would be same as Alternative B, except that motorized use would create user conflicts and diminish the non-mechanized river user experience.	Segments All segments would be recommended as not suitable, with long-term, adverse impacts on recreation from lack of resource protection and allowed surface disturbances.	Segments Same as Alternative B.	Segments Same as Alternative C because of non-suitability recommendation.
	WSR Indian Creek Segment Not evaluated for eligibility, but impacts on recreation would continue to be beneficial through	WSR Indian Creek Segment Long-term, beneficial impacts on resources and resource users because ORVs would be protected, while	WSR Indian Creek Segment Recommended as not suitable. Long-term, adverse impacts on resources from likely degradation of ORVs.	WSR Indian Creek Segment Recommended as not suitable. Same as Alternative C.	WSR Indian Creek Segment Same as Alternative B, except that additional resource protection along 0.6 miles of river corridor to protect	WSR Indian Creek Segment Recommended as not suitable. Same as Alternative C.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	management decisions under the current RMP, with a range of beneficial recreational opportunities for mechanized and non-mechanized users.	allowing recreation opportunities for motorized, non-motorized, and mountain bike users. Long term, adverse impacts from potential resource user conflicts.	Impacts on users would be long-term and adverse from degradation of resources and reduction in recreational opportunities.		areas with non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	
	WSR Fable Valley Segment Not evaluated for eligibility, but its location within a WSA ensures that impacts on recreation resources and non-mechanized recreation would be beneficial in the long term. Long-term, adverse impacts on mechanized user groups from WSA IMP restrictions on mechanized use and surface disturbances.	WSR Fable Valley Segment Recommended suitable, with same impacts as Alternative A from location within a WSA.	WSR Fable Valley Segment Recommend not suitable, but same impacts as Alternative A from location within a WSA.	WSR Fable Valley Segment Recommend not suitable, but same impacts as Alternative A from location within a WSA.	WSR Fable Valley Segment Same as Alternative B.	WSR Fable Valley Segment Same as Alternative C.
	WSR Dark Canyon Segment Not evaluated for eligibility, but its location within a WSA ensures that impacts on recreation resources and non-mechanized recreation would be beneficial in the long term. Long-term, adverse impacts on	WSR Dark Canyon Segment Recommended suitable, with same impacts as Alternative A from location within a WSA.	WSR Dark Canyon Segment Same as Alternative B.	WSR Dark Canyon Segment Recommend not suitable, but same impacts as Alternative A from location within a WSA.	WSR Dark Canyon Segment Same as Alternative B.	WSR Dark Canyon Segment Same as Alternative B.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	mechanized user groups from WSA IMP restrictions on mechanized use and surface disturbances.					
	<p>WSR San Juan River Segments</p> <p>Segment #1 not evaluated for eligibility, with impacts same as Colorado River Segment #1.</p> <p>Segment #2 recommended as eligible, with limited OHV use, VRM I objectives, and withdrawn mineral entry would have long-term, beneficial impacts on resources and all users because opportunities would continue to be available for mechanized and non-mechanized users. Segments #3, #4, and #5 would have same impacts as #2.</p>	<p>WSR San Juan River Segments</p> <p>Segment #1 recommended as suitable, managed as VRM III, NSO for minerals. Impacts to recreation would be negligible to minor because no recreation ORVs were found during eligibility study.</p> <p>Segment #2 recommended as suitable, with long-term, beneficial impacts on recreation resources and users. Increased use would create the potential for user conflicts between mechanized and non-mechanized users.</p> <p>Segment #3 recommended as suitable, with VRM I management, closed to OHV use, and mineral withdrawal that would have long-term, beneficial impacts on resources. Impacts on users would be variable:</p>	<p>WSR San Juan River Segments</p> <p>All segments recommended as not suitable.</p> <p>Segment #1 Impacts same as Alternative B.</p> <p>Segment #2 adverse, long-term impacts because eligibility study determined that the segment has Wild ORVs. Impacts on users would be adverse in the long-term because of likely resource degradation and diminished recreation opportunities.</p> <p>Segment #3 Impacts same as Segment #2.</p> <p>Segment #4 Impacts same as Segment #2.</p> <p>Segment #5 Impacts same as Segment #2.</p>	<p>WSR San Juan River Segments</p> <p>All segments recommended as not suitable.</p> <p>Segment #1 Impacts same as Alternative C.</p> <p>Segment #2 Impacts same as Alternative C.</p> <p>Segment #3 Impacts same as Alternative C.</p> <p>Segment #4 Impacts same as Alternative C.</p> <p>Segment #5 Impacts same as Alternative C.</p>	<p>WSR San Juan River Segments</p> <p>Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>WSR San Juan River Segments</p> <p>Segment #1 recommended as not suitable. Impacts same as Alternative C.</p> <p>Segment #2 recommended as not suitable. Impacts same as Alternative C.</p> <p>Segment #3 recommended as not suitable. Impacts same as Alternative C.</p> <p>Segment #4 recommended as not suitable. Impacts same as Alternative C.</p> <p>Segment #5 recommended as suitable. Impacts same as Alternative B.</p>

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

		OHV users would be adversely affected by lack of opportunities, but river floaters and non-mechanized users would benefit. Segment #4 recommended as suitable, and would have impacts same as Segment #2. Segment #5 recommended as suitable, and would have impacts same as Segment #3.				
	WSR Arch Canyon Segment Not evaluated for eligibility. Impacts same as Indian Creek segment.	WSR Arch Canyon Segment Recommended as suitable, with same as Indian Creek.	WSR Arch Canyon Segment Recommended as not suitable. Same as Indian Creek segment.	WSR Arch Canyon Segment Recommended as not suitable. Same as Indian Creek segment.	WSR Arch Canyon Segment Same as Alternative B.	WSR Arch Canyon Segment Same as Alternative C.
	WSR White Canyon Determined to be eligible. Beneficial, long-term impacts on recreation and users from resource protection and continued recreational opportunities.	WSR White Canyon Recommended as not suitable. Negligible impacts on recreation because of proposed SRMA under this alternative to protect recreation resources and opportunities.	WSR White Canyon Same as Alternative B.	WSR White Canyon Same as Alternative B.	WSR White Canyon Same as Alternative B.	WSR White Canyon Same as Alternative B.
	WSAs Current impacts on recreation and users would not change because past and future status would not change until congressional	WSAs Same as Alternative A.	WSAs Same as Alternative A.	WSAs Same as Alternative A.	WSAs Same as Alternative A.	WSAs Same as Alternative A.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	release: adverse impacts on mechanized recreation to preserve wilderness values; beneficial impacts on non-mechanized users from continued opportunities.					
Special Status Species	Negligible impacts on recreation.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Travel Management	<p>OHV Acres open to cross-country travel and acres designated as limited to designated routes OHV use would be beneficial to mechanized users, but adverse in the long-term for non-mechanized users and resources from resources degradation and intensifying resource use conflicts.</p> <p>Special Stipulation Areas Long-term, adverse impacts from OHV exclusion and access within McLoyd Canyon-Moon House site. Long-term, beneficial impacts from restricting travel in Arch Canyon by preserving wildlife viewing opportunities;</p>	<p>OHV Short- and long-term, beneficial impacts to resources from eliminated OHV cross-country travel and restrictions to designated routes, and reduction in user conflicts. Beneficial impacts on non-mechanized, mountain biking, and river floaters from closed or designated routes. Long-term, adverse impacts on motorized OHV groups from elimination of Open OHV areas.</p> <p>Special Stipulation Areas Impacts to McLoyd Canyon-Moon House same as Alternative A, but long-term, beneficial impacts to resource</p>	<p>OHV Same as Alternative B, except that long-term, adverse impacts would occur within 2,311 acres designated as Open to OHV use.</p> <p>Special Stipulation Areas Impacts to McLoyd Canyon-Moon House same as Alternative B. Impacts to Arch Canyon same as Alternative A.</p>	<p>OHV Resource impacts same as Alternative B. Long-term, adverse impacts on motorized OHV cross-country use from substantial reduction in area, but increased opportunities for designated route OHV recreation.</p> <p>Special Stipulation Areas Impacts to McLoyd Canyon-Moon House same as Alternative A. Impacts to Arch Canyon resources same as Alternative C.</p>	<p>OHV All OHV travel within non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be prohibited, with long-term, substantially adverse impacts on motorized OHV, mountain biking and competitive (specialized) motorized users from reduced opportunities. Long-term, beneficial impacts on non-mechanized users from increased areas closed to motorized users.</p> <p>Special Stipulation Areas Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>OHV Same as Alternative B.</p> <p>Special Stipulation Areas Impacts within McLoyd Canyon-Moon House site same as Alternative B. Beneficial impacts within Arch Canyon for mechanized and non-mechanized users, but long term, adverse impacts from user conflicts between mechanized and non-mechanized users.</p>

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	likelihood for adverse impacts from proximity of non-mechanized and mechanized users within the canyon.	preservation. Long-term, adverse impacts to mechanized recreation from closing Arch Canyon to OHV use by reducing recreational opportunities; beneficial impacts to non-mechanized users..				
Vegetation Management	Impacts same as Fire Management because treatments and impacts are the same.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Visual Resources	Long-term, beneficial protection-related impacts on recreation resources and related scenic quality preservation, and long-term, beneficial impacts on all resource user groups from designation of 371,575 acres as VRM Class I and 355,112 acres as VRM II (41% of the PA).	497,668 acres designated under VRM Class I (33% more than Alternative A) and 250,641 acres as VRM II, with impacts same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree. Approximately 42% of the planning area would be managed for high scenic quality.	425,179 acres designated under VRM Class I (14% more than Alternative A) and 132,001 as VRM II, with long-term, adverse impacts to recreation from 10% less protection of scenic quality than Alternative A. Approximately 31% of the planning area would be managed for high scenic quality.	390,424 acres designated under VRM Class I (5% more than Alternative A) and 8,838 acres as VRM II, with long-term, adverse impacts to recreation from a 19% reduction in scenic quality protection than Alternative A. High scenic quality would be protected on 22% of the PA.	998,370 acres designated as VRM I (269% more acreage than Alternative A), including areas designated as VRM Class I to protect non-WSA wilderness characteristics, with long-term, beneficial impacts on scenic resources. This alternative would protect scenic quality under VRM Class I and II management objectives on 62% of the PA.	424,989 acres managed under VRM Class I objectives (3% more than Alternative A) and 228,041 acres managed under VRM Class II to protect scenic quality on 37% of the PA, with adverse impacts to recreation from a 5% reduction in higher levels of scenic quality protection than Alternative A.
Wildlife and Fisheries Resources	Seasonal closing of wildlife habitat would have short-term, adverse impacts on motorized OHV recreation to protect	Short-term, adverse restrictions on all commercial or permitted OHV use within crucial wildlife habitat.	Same as Alternative B, except that 135 miles of commercial and permitted OHV routes would be affected.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	crucial habitat.	Approximately 512 miles of OHV routes would be affected.				
Woodlands	Long-term, adverse noise and visual impacts on non-mechanized, some motorized OHV, specialized, scenic driving, and mountain biking groups from intrusive OHV and chainsaw noise impacts, trash, OHV surface disturbances, and remnants of woodland harvesting.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
RIPARIAN RESOURCES						
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Fire Management	Fuels management treatments on approximately 5,000 to 10,000 acres annually would be adverse in the short-term from increased sedimentation and runoff from prescribed burn surface disturbances. Long-term beneficial impacts from reduction in wildland fire risk and establishment of a more natural fire return interval.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Lands and Realty	Beneficial impacts from ROW exclusions	Beneficial impacts from ROW exclusions	Beneficial impacts from ROW exclusions	Beneficial impacts from ROW	Beneficial impacts from ROW exclusions	Beneficial impacts from ROW exclusions

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	on 120,800 acres that would limit surface and vegetation disturbances and changes in hydrology.	on 416,612 acres that would limit surface and vegetation disturbances and changes in hydrology.	on 434,652 acres that would limit surface and vegetation disturbances and changes in hydrology.	exclusions on 401,028 acres that would limit surface and vegetation disturbances and changes in hydrology.	on 1,028,378 acres that would limit surface and vegetation disturbances and changes in hydrology.	on 559,509 acres that would limit surface and vegetation disturbances and changes in hydrology.
Livestock Grazing	The total riparian area open to grazing would be 17,600 acres; unavailable acreage would be 2,400 acres. Beneficial impacts from resource protection and enhancement through proper herd management. Proper livestock grazing would benefit riparian systems by ensuring recruitment of riparian plant species. Riparian exclosures would protect and enhance riparian vegetation. Overall, Alternative A has the fewest riparian areas unavailable for livestock grazing compared to all other alternatives. Compliance with Standard 2 would minimize adverse impacts to riparian areas by requiring changes in grazing management wherever monitoring	17,200 riparian acres would be open to grazing; 2,800 would be unavailable. Seasonal restrictions, closures, and/or forage utilization limits on grazing in riparian areas, especially those Functioning at Risk. The closure of riparian areas to grazing would protect riparian vegetation, as described under A. Alternative B provides the largest number of riparian acres excluded from grazing, which would have more long-term, beneficial impacts on riparian resources in those excluded areas than Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.	Alternative D would have 18,020 acres open and 2,380 acres unavailable to livestock grazing. There would be no seasonal restrictions, closures, and/or forage utilization limits on grazing riparian areas Functioning At Risk, therefore fewer reductions in adverse impacts would occur, as compared to Alternatives B and C. This alternative would have impacts the same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	shows degradation of riparian areas when PFC in not achieved.					
Minerals	Oil and gas development would be managed with NSO mineral leasing stipulations in riparian areas. The Monticello FO would follow BLM guidelines for managing riparian areas (Technical Reference 1737-6, as updated) and Utah Riparian Management Policy. All floodplains and riparian/wetlands would be managed in accordance with Executive Orders 11988 and 119900, Sections 303 and 404 of the Clean Water Act, and the ESA. These orders would protect riparian resources and floodplains from surface disturbance and vegetation removal. No new surface-disturbing activities will be allowed within 100 meters of riparian/wetlands unless it can be shown that: a) there are no practical alternatives or, b) all	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	long term impacts can be fully mitigated or, c) the activity will benefit and enhance the riparian area.					
Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	No impacts to riparian resources in these lands from special management to protect non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics because no lands would be managed to protect their wilderness characteristics.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Beneficial impacts to riparian resources from protection of wilderness characteristics on 582,360 acres from closure to minerals, OHV travel, ROW permitting, and through management under VRM Class I objectives.	Same as Alternative E, except managing 88,871 acres with slightly less protective stipulations.
Recreation	Short term and Long-term, adverse impacts to riparian resources from dispersed recreation-related and OHV-caused stream bank vegetation trampling; soil compaction, sedimentation, erosion, and indirect spread of invasive species. Impacts mitigated by BLM through recreation guidelines and stipulations to protect riparian resources.	Similar to Alternative A, but with less adverse impacts from increased restrictions on recreation in riparian areas, riparian areas closed to OHV use, limits on river use, and other recreation restrictions that would protect riparian resources.	Recreation actions would provide more protection to riparian resources than Alternatives A and D, but less than Alternatives B and E.	Similar to Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B, except that restrictions on OHV use would be greater, with fewer potential impacts to riparian areas from OHV use.	Same as Alternative C, except that no areas would be open to OHV use and more areas would be limited to designated routes.
Riparian Resources	Long-term, beneficial impacts on riparian resources from NSO stipulations, grazing and rangeland health	Similar to Alternative A, with additional closures for areas at risk of degradation.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	standards, and floodplain protection.					
Soil and Water Resources	Indirect, long term, adverse impacts from sedimentation and soil erosion on riparian because of a lack of steep-slope surface disturbances restrictions.	Long-term, beneficial indirect impacts from surface disturbance restrictions on slopes >40% slopes (approximately 87,456 acres).	Same as Alternative B, except surface-disturbing activities would not be permitted on slopes greater than 40% unless determined that it would cause undue or unnecessary degradation to pursue other placement alternatives.	Same as Alternative B, except the impacts of soils and watershed management decisions would require a plan including an erosion control strategy, survey, and design for development of land with a slope greater than 40%.	Same as Alternative B.	
Special Designations	Long-term, adverse impacts from minerals activities within ACECs through vegetation trampling and removal, habitat fragmentation, and invasive species infestation. Long-term, beneficial impacts from OHV motorized-use protection, and protection within WSAs.	Long-term, beneficial protection within WSAs, ACECs, and W&SR segments, from OHV limitations, and limits on vegetation treatments.	Same as Alternative B, but with slightly less protective management within ACECs.	Impacts the same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B, except that riparian areas in 109,206 acres of ACECs in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed with additional protective restrictions on woodland harvest, mineral entry, surface disturbance, and ROWs.	Same as Alternative B, except that riparian areas in 25,410 acres of ACECs in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed with additional protective restrictions on woodland harvest, mineral entry, surface disturbance, and ROWs.
Special Status Species	Long-term, beneficial impacts to riparian areas, from protection of special status species habitat.	Same as Alternative A, except additional beneficial impacts from limiting OHV use to a designated route near T37S, R20E, Section 16.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	
Vegetation	No impacts on riparian resources because no	Adverse, direct and indirect short term impacts from	Impacts same as B, except treatment of 400 (80%) fewer	Same as Alternative C.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative C.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	vegetation treatments are proposed in riparian areas.	vegetation treatments causing increased runoff and sedimentation due to loss of vegetative cover. Long-term, beneficial impacts from riparian condition improvement after treatments. This would be 500 (100%) more acres of riparian treatment than under Alternative A.	acres of riparian habitat than under Alternative B.			
Visual Resources	Under Alternative A, 12,200 acres of riparian habitat would be beneficially protected under VRM Class I and II objectives.	Same as Alternative A, except 1,000 fewer acres (11,200 total acres) of riparian habitat would be protected.	Same as Alternative A, except 8,600 acres of riparian habitat would be beneficially protected under VRM Class I and II objectives.	Under Alternative D, 5,300 acres of riparian habitat would be beneficially protected under VRM Class I and II objectives. This alternative would provide the least benefit to riparian resources.	Same as Alternative B, except more riparian area would be beneficially protected under VRM Class I and II objectives than any of the other alternatives (13,704 acres of riparian habitat).	Under the Proposed Plan, 10,835 acres of riparian habitat would be beneficially protected under VRM Class I and II objectives.
Wildlife and Fisheries Resources	Long-term, direct benefits to riparian resources from maintenance and/or improvement of lowland riparian and wetlands habitats. Some loss of riparian vegetation from elk grazing.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Woodlands	Potential adverse impacts from vegetation disturbance, reduction	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	or loss of woody shrub and canopy vegetation in riparian habitat from permitted harvesting of cottonwood and willow for ceremonial purposes.					
SOCIOECONOMICS						
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Cultural Resources	Long-term, adverse impacts to cultural resource-related tourism revenue from minimal restrictions and protection of cultural resources (37,433 acres).	A 162% increase (98,348 acres) in protected cultural resources could beneficially increase cultural resource-related tourism. Increased quality and quantity of cultural sites would likely have long-term beneficial impacts on the local economy as compared to Alternative A.	Impacts same as Alternative B, except reduced protection for the Tank Bench areas could have adverse impacts on tourism and connections to the cultural heritage of the area.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except acreage subject to special management considerations increased by 5% (38,995 acres).	Same as Alternative B, except that areas designated as NSO would be closed in the Comb Ridge.	Impacts same as Alternative B, except reduced protection for the Tank Bench areas could have adverse impacts on tourism and connections to the cultural heritage of the area
Livestock Grazing	No changes in existing socioeconomic conditions (employment, sales tax revenue, culture).	Same as Alternative A, except a 0.7% reduction in acres available for grazing and a 0.08% reduction in AUMs. This is not likely to impact social conditions, jobs or income.	Similar to Alternative B, as AUMs are identical but there is a 6.3% increase in acres available for grazing.	Same as Alternative A, but with a 0.01% reduction in acres and 0.02% reduction in AUMs	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A, except a 0.7% reduction in acres available for grazing and a 0.08% reduction in AUMs. This is not likely to impact social conditions, jobs or income.
Minerals	Long-term, beneficial economic impacts to local communities from employment,	Same as Alternative A, except total well potential would differ by only 7 wells (73	Same as Alternative A, except the total well potential would differ by only one well	Same as Alternative A, except total well potential would differ by only 2 wells (73	Same as Alternative A, with the well potential differing by 19 wells (73 wells under	Same as Alternative A, except the total well potential would differ by only one well

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	taxes, royalties, bonus payments and annual rent payments from minerals development: Estimated annual revenue from oil and gas development: 5 oil wells-\$251,225 and 5 natural gas wells-\$312,350.	wells under Alternative A and 66 wells under B)	(73 wells under Alternative A and 74 under Alternative C).	wells under Alternative A and 75 wells under Alternative D).	Alternative A and 54 wells under Alternative E). Estimated annual revenue from oil and gas development: 3 oil wells - \$150,735 and 3 natural gas wells - \$187,410.	(73 wells under Alternative A and 72 under the Proposed Plan).
Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	No impacts, as no non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed for wilderness characteristics.	No impacts, as no non-WSA lands would be managed for wilderness characteristics.	No impacts, as no non-WSA lands would be managed for wilderness characteristics	No impacts, as no non-WSA lands would be managed for wilderness characteristics.	Management prescriptions for 582,357 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics has some potential for positive impacts on local economy with the potential for some socioeconomic losses due to restricted activities in these areas.	Same as Alternative E, but to a lesser extent as managing for 5 units and 88,871 acres.
Recreation and Travel Management	No changes in current socioeconomic trends (\$35.5 million in spending and 1,083 jobs in 2003).	Minor, adverse impacts on socioeconomics from decreased group/trip sizes within SRMAs, resulting in fewer visitors. Long-term, beneficial impacts on non-motorized activities would be greater than under Alternative A, but less than under Alternative E.	Similar impacts to Alternative A, with greater potential for increased visitation and economic contributions to local economy than Alternative B. Reduced potential relative to Alternative A for long-term, adverse social impacts due to user conflicts, crowding, and degradation to	Similar to Alternative A, except for a slightly greater potential benefit to short-term economic conditions as group, trip, and use limits would be least restrictive under this alternative. Reduced potential relative to Alternative A for long-term, adverse social	Minor, adverse impacts on socioeconomics from decreased group/trip sizes within SRMAs, resulting in fewer visitors. Long-term, beneficial impacts on non-motorized activities would be greatest under this alternative. Minor adverse economic impacts on	Similar impacts to Alternative A, with greater potential for increased visitation and economic contributions to local economy than Alternative B. Reduced potential relative to Alternative A for long-term, adverse social impacts due to user conflicts, crowding, and degradation to

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

		Reduction in OHV open acreage to zero would have potentially adverse social impacts on those OHV users desiring an unrestricted motorized experience.	the environment Reduction in OHV open acreage to 2311 acres would have potentially adverse social impacts on those OHV users desiring an unrestricted motorized experience	impacts due to user conflicts, crowding, and degradation to the environment, but greater potential for such adverse effects than Alternatives B, C or E. Reduction in OHV open acreage to 2311 acres would have potentially adverse social impacts on those OHV users desiring an unrestricted motorized experience.	businesses and individuals relying on development (especially minerals) of public lands for their livelihoods. Potential economic benefits to those individuals and businesses catering to groups or individuals desiring more primitive recreation experiences. Reduction in OHV open acreage to zero would have potentially adverse social impacts on those OHV users desiring an unrestricted motorized experience.	the environment. Reduction in OHV open acreage to 97 acres would have potentially adverse social impacts on those OHV users desiring an unrestricted motorized experience.
Special Designations	Negligible economic impacts from anticipated level of minerals development and OHV access. No W&SR designation beneficial to minerals development but potential adverse impacts to revenues generated from river user groups.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except adverse impacts to mineral development and subsequent economic revenue would be slightly greater with 521,141 acres (7% increase compared to Alternative A) proposed as ACECs. Adverse impacts to mineral development from seasonal prohibitions of SRPs in ACECs. Long-term, adverse impacts from	Impacts similar to Alternative A, with 76,764 acres of proposed ACECs. Long-term beneficial and adverse impacts same as B for WSRs, but more beneficial for minerals development and less beneficial for recreation users. Opportunities for tourism-based revenue as a result of the designations would be less than	Beneficial minerals-related impacts, as Alternative D would not recommend ACEC or WSR designations.	ACECs— Impacts same as Alternative B, with 521,141 acres (7% increase compared to Alternative A) proposed as ACECs and same amount of W&SR designations.	Impacts similar to Alternative C, with 74,403 acres of proposed as ACECs. Long-term beneficial and adverse impacts similar to B for WSRs, but more beneficial for minerals development and less beneficial for recreation users as 62% fewer miles are recommended Opportunities for tourism-based revenue as a result of

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

		designating 92.4 miles as recommended for W&SR status, limiting minerals development. Long-term, beneficial impacts from revenue generated from river user groups.	Alternative B.			the designations would be less than Alternative B.
Visual Resources	Adverse impacts to socioeconomics would be negligible to minor given the amount of VRM III and IV lands (over 1 million acres) open for mineral development and the small amount of wells projected to be drilled over the life of the plan (76 wells).	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A, though fewer acres of VRM III and VRM IV.	Same as Alternative A.
SOIL AND WATER RESOURCES						
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Air Quality	No impacts to soils and water resources.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Cultural Resources	Adverse impacts to soils and water resources from watershed treatments and limited controls on disposal of human waste, pets and livestock, and other soil disturbing activities. Long-term, adverse impacts of cultural	Same as Alternative A, except 78,012 acres would be protected as designated CSMAs, with fewer adverse impacts to soils and water resources than Alternative A due to greater restrictions on human waste, pets and livestock.	Adverse impacts to soils and water resources same as Alternative A with same restrictions as Alternative B, except a smaller area would be designated as CSMAs. This alternative would have fewer short- and long-term adverse impacts on soils and	Adverse impacts on soils and water resources same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree. This alternative would have fewer short- and long-term adverse impacts than Alternative A, but greater impacts than Alternatives B	Adverse impacts on soils and water resources same as Alternative A with same restrictions as Alternative B, except the Comb Ridge and Beef Basin CSMAs would also be closed to oil and gas leasing, new improvements for range/wildlife/watersheds and OHV use. This	Same as Alternative C.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	decisions on soils and water resources would be partially mitigated due to the closure of the Grand Gulch Special Emphasis area to surface-disturbing activities (37,433 acres).		water resources than Alternative A, but greater impacts than Alternative B.	and C.	alternative would provide greater protection for soils and water resources than any other alternative.	
Fire Management	Short-term, adverse impacts on soils and water resources due to increased sedimentation and run-off in areas where vegetation has been treated, with long-term beneficial impacts due to reduced fuel loading and reduced fire risk.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Health and Safety	Short term, beneficial impacts on soils and water resources where Abandoned Mine Lands (AMLs) are rehabilitated; long term, beneficial impacts on soils and water resources by reducing the detrimental impacts of AML water drainage.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Lands and Realty	No impacts to soils and water resources.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Livestock Grazing	Long-term, beneficial impacts from livestock grazing reductions on	Long-term, beneficial impacts from seasonal restrictions,	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative C.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	23,200 acres of soils with limitations.	closures, and/or forage utilization limits on grazing in riparian areas, especially those Functioning at Risk. Alternative B would exclude grazing on 26,200 acres, which would have greater long-term, beneficial impacts than Alternative A.				
Minerals and Energy Resources	Short-term and long-term, adverse impacts from minerals disturbances from loss of vegetative cover, sedimentation of surface waters and loss of soil productivity. Under Alternative A, the following approximate acreages of sensitive soils would be open for mineral leasing and potential adverse impacts: 77,600 acres of highly wind erodible soils; 15,000 acres of highly water erodible soils; 217,300 acres of reclamation sensitive soils, and a total 1,585 acres estimated surface disturbance from mineral development and exploration.	Same impacts as Alternative A, except: 74,000 acres of highly wind erodible soils; 15,100 acres of highly water erodible soils; 276,930 acres of reclamation sensitive soils would be open for mineral leasing. A total of 3,300 more wind erodible; 200 less water erodible; and 37,500 less reclamation sensitive soils would be closed compared to Alternative A. Total estimated surface disturbance from mineral development and exploration would be 155 fewer acres than under Alternative A. An additional 851 acres of surface disturbance would occur over 15 years	Same impacts as Alternative A, except: 83,476 acres of highly wind erodible soils; 16,443 acres of highly water erodible soils; and 311,700 acres of reclamation sensitive soils would be open for mineral leasing. A total of 5,800 less wind erodible, 15,568 more water erodible, and 19,100 less acres of reclamation sensitive soils would be closed compared to Alternative A. Total estimated surface disturbance from mineral development and exploration would be 28 more acres than under Alternative A. An additional 851 acres of surface disturbance would occur over 15 years	Same impacts as Alternative A, except: 84,700 acres of highly wind erodible soils; 17,000 acres of highly water erodible soils; and 314,800 acres of reclamation sensitive soils would be open for mineral leasing. A total of 21,600 less wind erodible acres, 2,100 less water erodible, and 22,300 less acres of reclamation-limited soils would be closed compared to Alternative A. Total estimated surface disturbance from mineral development and exploration would be 60 more acres than under Alternative A. An additional 851	Same impacts as Alternative A, except: 29,732 acres of highly wind erodible soils; 7,878 acres of highly water erodible soils; 196,031 acres of reclamation sensitive soils would be open for mineral leasing. A total of 47,769 more wind erodible, 7,028 more water erodible, and 96,491 more acres of reclamation sensitive acres would be closed compared to Alternative A. Total estimated surface disturbance from mineral development and exploration would be 476 fewer acres than under Alternative A. An additional 851 acres of surface disturbance would occur over 15 years	Same impacts as Alternative A, except: 72,573 acres of highly wind erodible soils; 14,570 acres of highly water erodible soils; and 274,712 acres of reclamation sensitive soils would be open for mineral leasing. A total of 4,916 more wind erodible, 11,034 more water erodible, and 17,812 more acres of reclamation sensitive soils would be closed compared to Alternative A. Total estimated surface disturbance from mineral development and exploration would be 28 more acres than under Alternative A. An additional 851 acres of surface

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

		due to the development of uranium and vanadium (300 acres), placer gold (10 acres), limestone (50 acres), sand and gravel (360), building stone (113 acres), and clay (18 acres).	due to the development of uranium and vanadium (300 acres), placer gold (10 acres), limestone (50 acres), sand and gravel (360), building stone (113 acres), and clay (18 acres).	acres of surface disturbance would occur over 15 years due to the development of uranium and vanadium (300 acres), placer gold (10 acres), limestone (50 acres), sand and gravel (360), building stone (113 acres), and clay (18 acres).	due to the development of uranium and vanadium (300 acres), placer gold (10 acres), limestone (50 acres), sand and gravel (360), building stone (113 acres), and clay (18 acres).	disturbance would occur over 15 years due to the development of uranium and vanadium (300 acres), placer gold (10 acres), limestone (50 acres), sand and gravel (360), building stone (113 acres), and clay (18 acres).
Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	No effect on soil and water resources as no actions are prescribed to protect the wilderness characteristics of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	A total of 582,360 acres of non-WSA lands would be managed to maintain their wilderness characteristics, with long-term beneficial impacts to soils and water resources.	Same as Alternative E, except 5 units (88,871 acres) would be managed to maintain, protect and improve wilderness characteristics.
Paleontology	Negligible impacts to soils and water resources.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Recreation	Potential short- and long-term impacts to soils and water resources associated with recreation activities include damage to streambanks and associated vegetation, soil compaction, increased erosion, and sedimentation of surface waters.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except to a lesser degree, from restrictions on recreation-related soil and water resource impacts within SRMAs.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B, except more adverse, long term impacts from fewer restrictions and limits on recreational use.	Same as Alternative B, except that no OHV travel would be allowed within non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (582,360 acres).	Same as Alternative B except that OHV travel would be limited to designated routes within non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (88,871 acres).

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

Riparian Resources	Long-term, beneficial protection of soils and water resources from NSO in riparian areas, management to achieve riparian PFC, and no new surface-disturbing activities allowed within active floodplains or within 100 meters of riparian areas.	Same as Alternative A, except selected areas would be closed to motorized use and livestock trailing, which would result in minor beneficial reductions in impacts to soils and water resources.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Soil and Water Resources	There would be no additional impacts under Alternative A.	Long-term, beneficial impacts from prohibitions on steep-slope surface-disturbing activities (slopes >40%), and erosion control designs and plans for slopes between 21 and 40%. These measures would reduce erosion and sedimentation relative to Alternative A.	Long-term, beneficial impacts from restrictions on surface disturbance on slopes >40% unless it were determined that it would cause undue or unnecessary degradation to pursue other placement alternatives. These measures would reduce erosion and sedimentation relative to Alternative A.	Adverse impacts same as A, but to a lesser degree, from required plans and erosion control strategies for slopes >40%. Under Alternative D, the impacts of soils and watershed management decisions on soils resources would require a plan including an erosion control plan. These measures would reduce erosion and sedimentation relative to Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B, except there would be additional restrictions on surface-disturbing activities in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. Overall impacts to soils and water resources would be less adverse under Alternative E than under any of the alternatives.	Same as Alternative C.
Special Designations	Long-term, adverse impacts from mineral leasing, geophysical work, mineral material disposal, mineral entry, woodland harvesting, vegetation treatments, grazing,	Impacts same as Alternative A, except with fewer adverse impacts within ACECs from greater surface disturbance restrictions. ACEC designation would	Impacts same as Alternative B, but to a greater degree from an increase in allowable surface-disturbing activities. ACEC designation would result in the	Long-term, adverse impacts from allowed surface disturbance impacts to soils and water. No special designations or zero acres of sensitive soils are protected,	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative C.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	and OHV use within ACECs. A total of 113,000 acres of sensitive soils would be within designated ACECs, wherein impacts to soil and water resources would be reduced.	result in the protection of 7,385 more acres of sensitive soils than under Alternative A.	protection of 98,000 fewer acres of sensitive soils than under Alternative A.	which is 113,000 fewer acres than Alternative A. This alternative would have the least protections for sensitive soils of the alternatives.		
Special Status Species	Long-term, beneficial impacts to soils and water from special status species habitat protection.	Beneficial impacts same as Alternative A, except to a greater degree, due to more acres of protected habitat for special status species that would protect soils and water resources.	Beneficial impacts same as Alternative B, except to a lesser degree due to fewer acres of protected habitat for special status species.	There would be negligible beneficial impacts compared to Alternative A, as this alternative would have the fewest acres with surface disturbance restrictions in special status species habitat, with the greatest potential for long-term, adverse impacts on soils and water resources of the alternatives.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative C.
Travel Management	Potential short- and long-term impacts to soils and water resources associated with travel management decisions include damage to streambanks and associated vegetation, soil compaction, increased erosion, and sedimentation of surface waters. A total of 285,700 acres of	Impacts same as Alternative A, except a total of 63,900 acres would be open to OHV use on designated routes, which is 221,800 fewer acres of sensitive soils open than under Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B, except 64,400 acres of sensitive soils would be open to OHV use on designated routes, which is 221,300 fewer acres of sensitive soils open than under Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B, except 64,500 acres of sensitive soils would be open to OHV use, mostly limited to designated routes, which is 221,200 fewer acres of sensitive soils open than under Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B, except no OHV travel would be permitted in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (582,360 acres), which is 296,660 more acres of closed or limited OHV use than Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B, except 64,400 acres of sensitive soils would be open to OHV use on designated routes, which is 221,300 fewer acres of sensitive soils open than under Alternative A.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	sensitive soils would be closed to OHV use or limited to designated routes.					
Vegetation	Short-term adverse impacts from vegetation treatment-related increased erosion and water runoff. Long-term, beneficial impacts from reduced soil compaction, erosion, and sedimentation through increase in native vegetation cover, and a reduction of invasive weed species. Existing vegetation treatments would occur on 232,100 acres.	Fewer short-term adverse impacts and fewer long-term beneficial impacts than Alternative A on soils and water resources than Alternative A from treatments on 7,600 acres/year, with 118,100 fewer acres of vegetation treatment over the LOP than Alternative A. Alternative B would have fewer short-term adverse impacts and long-term beneficial impacts to soils and water resources than Alternative A	Same as Alternative B, except 9,300 acres would be open to vegetation treatments each year to restore ecosystem health, with 92,600 fewer acres of vegetation treatment over the LOP than Alternative A. Alternative C would have fewer short-term adverse impacts and long-term beneficial impacts to soils and water resources than Alternative A, more than Alternatives B and E.	More long-term beneficial impacts from vegetation treatments on soils and water resources under Alternative D than under Alternatives B or C due to 11,300 acres/year targeted for vegetation treatment, with 62,600 fewer acres of vegetation treatment over the LOP than Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B, except for wilderness characteristics lands where no new land treatments would be allowed.	Same as Alternative C.
Visual Resources	Under Alternative A, 192,136 acres of sensitive soils would be managed as VRM Class I and II, with the second greatest level of beneficial, long-term protection for soils and water resources due to an increase in surface-disturbing restrictions under VRM Class I and II objectives.	Under Alternative B, 186,102 acres of sensitive soils, 6,034 fewer acres than Alternative A, would be managed as VRM Class I and II, with the third greatest long-term, beneficial impacts from surface disturbance restrictions.	Same impacts as Alternative B, except 146,582 acres of sensitive soils, 45,554 fewer acres than Alternative A, would be managed as VRM Class I and II with beneficial impacts from surface disturbance restrictions.	Greatest potential for adverse impacts due to 87,832 acres of sensitive soils, 104,304 fewer acres than Alternative A, managed as VRM Class I and II to restrict surface disturbances.	Under Alternative E, 293,059 acres of sensitive soils, 100,923 more acres than Alternative A, would be managed as VRM Class I and II, with the greatest potential long-term, beneficial impacts from surface disturbance restrictions.	Same impacts as Alternative B, except 176,987 acres of sensitive soils, 15,149 fewer acres than Alternative A, would be managed as VRM Class I and II with beneficial impacts from surface disturbance restrictions.
Wildlife and Fisheries	Maintenance and/or	Same as Alternative	Same as Alternative	Same as Alternative	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

Resources	improvement of wildlife and fisheries habitats would have indirect, beneficial impacts by ensuring the ecological functions of these systems, including soils and water within lowland riparian and wetland areas, and low and high desert scrub communities.	A.	A.	A.		A.
Woodlands	Under Alternative A, 1,309,894 acres would be open to woodland harvest, with the highest risk of adverse, long-term impacts to soils and water resources from vegetation loss and surface disturbances by motorized OHV and foot traffic during harvesting.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, except to a lesser degree due to 579,820 (44%) fewer acres open to woodland harvest than under Alternative A. This alternative would have fewer adverse impacts on soils and water resources than Alternative A, but greater impacts than Alternative E.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, except to a lesser degree due to 467,956 (36%) fewer acres open to woodland harvest than under Alternative A.	Same as Alternative C.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, except to a lesser degree due to 761,417 (58%) fewer acres open to woodland harvest than under Alternative A. This alternative would have the least adverse impacts on soils and water resources of the alternatives.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, except to a lesser degree due to 471,955 (36%) fewer acres open to woodland harvest than under Alternative A.
SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS						
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Special Designations	Management of 513,457 acres as ACECs, but under prescriptions that would generally not be as beneficially protective of ACEC values as Alternatives	521,141 acres managed as ACECs, with long term protection of relevant and important values. 92.4 miles of river segments would be recommended	Smallest area (76,764 acres) of the Monticello Planning Area managed as ACECs, except for Alternative D. Alternative C would be more protective of	Long-term, adverse impacts to relevant and important values resulting from no ACEC management. No river segments would be recommended	Impacts the same as Alternative B, except additional long-term, beneficial impacts to relevant and important ACEC values from protection of 109,206 acres of non-WSA	Same effects on ACEC values as described for Alternative C except for 73,495 acres. 35.7 miles of river segments would be recommended

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	B and E. River segments determined eligible in the 1991 San Juan RMP would be protected. WSAs would be managed to protect their wilderness values.	suitable for wild and scenic river designation, protecting free-flowing rivers, outstandingly remarkable river values, and river classification. WSA impact same as Alternative A.	ACEC values than Alternatives D, but less protective than Alternatives A, B, or E. 18.4 miles of river recommended suitable for wild and scenic river designation, protecting the free-flowing condition of the rivers, outstandingly remarkable river values, and river classification. WSA impacts same as Alternative A.	suitable for wild and scenic river designation. Thus, no protection of free-flowing condition, outstandingly remarkable river values, or river classification. WSA impacts same as Alternative A.	lands with wilderness characteristics. Wild and scenic river suitability recommendations and impacts same as Alternative B. WSA impacts same as Alternative A.	suitable for wild and scenic river designation, protecting free-flowing rivers, outstandingly remarkable river values, and river classification. WSA impact same as Alternative A
All Other Resources	Impacts to specially designated areas from other resource management decisions are discussed under the applicable resources' analysis of impacts.					
SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES						
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Air Quality	No impacts to special status species.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Cultural Resources	Long-term, adverse impacts from cultural resource decisions include disturbance of wildlife, trampling of sensitive plants, and introduction of invasive species. These impacts would be partially mitigated by the closure of Grand Gulch NED (37,433 acres) to	Same as Alternative A, except there would be fewer impacts under Alternative B due to the designation of SRMAs and associated restrictions on surface-disturbing activities. Adverse impacts to special status species from	Same total acreage and impacts as Alternative B, except more surface-disturbing activities and visitors would be permitted in these areas than Alternative B, with overall impacts less than under Alternative A.	No acres would be designated as special management areas, which would have greater short-term and long-term, adverse impacts than Alternatives B and C, but fewer impacts than Alternative A.	Impacts same as Alternative B.	Impacts same as Alternative B.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	surface-disturbing activities such as woodland products gathering, mineral leasing, OHV use, and vegetation treatments.	surface-disturbing activities and other human disturbances under Alternative B would be considerably reduced from Alternative A due to restrictions on surface disturbances and use within the designated CSMA, SRMA, and the 37,388 acres Grand Gulch National Historic District.				
Fire Management	Short-term adverse impacts from surface disturbance associated with fuels treatments, including trampling and crushing, habitat alteration, and introduction of invasive species. Long-term beneficial impacts would also occur due to reduced fuel loading, reduced fire risk, and diversified habitat on 5,000-10,000 acres/year.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Health and Safety	Potential adverse loss of special status bat habitat. Clean-up of hazardous spills and abandoned mines would help mitigate the adverse effects of	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	water contamination on TES fish species.					
Lands and Realty	In areas where ROWs would be authorized, there could be long-term direct, adverse impacts on special status species habitat where installation would occur. These impacts would result from vegetation crushing and removal associated with construction and habitat fragmentation. Short-term direct impacts could result from noise disturbances. Long-term indirect adverse impacts could result from the potential introduction of invasive plant species by construction equipment and building personnel. 374,590 acres would be avoided or excluded from ROW development.	Same as Alternative A, except 541,717 acres would be avoided or excluded from ROW development.	Same as Alternative A, except 434,652 acres would be avoided or excluded from ROW development.	Same as Alternative A, except 401,028 acres would be avoided or excluded from ROW development.	Same as Alternative A, except 1,028,378 acres would be avoided or excluded from ROW development.	Same as Alternative A, except 549,408 acres would be avoided or excluded from ROW development.
Livestock Grazing	Adverse impacts include trampling, reduced forage and cover, reduced habitat quality and biodiversity, and introduction of invasive species.	Adverse and beneficial impacts same as Alternative A, except 141,160 acres would be unavailable for grazing.	Adverse and beneficial impacts same as Alternative A, except 136,261 acres would be unavailable for grazing.	Adverse and beneficial impacts same as Alternative A, except 132,108 acres would be unavailable for grazing.	Same as Alternative B.	Adverse and beneficial impacts same as Alternative A, except 141,816 acres would be unavailable for grazing.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	Under Alternative A, 128,098 acres would be unavailable for grazing.					
Minerals and Energy Resources	Adverse impacts from mineral development and exploration include direct mortality, surface disturbance, habitat degradation, and habitat fragmentation. Oil and gas leasing would include 161,941 acres of special status species habitat closed or NSO to oil and gas leasing and mineral entry.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, except fewer acres of special status species habitat would be impacted than under Alternative A: Oil and gas leasing would include 207,303 acres of special status species habitat closed or NSO to oil and gas leasing and mineral entry..	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, except more acres of special status species habitat would be impacted than under Alternative A. Oil and gas leasing would include 150,211 acres of special status species habitat closed or NSO to oil and gas leasing and mineral entry.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, except more acres of special status species habitat would be impacted than under Alternative A: Oil and gas leasing would include 146,962 acres of special status species habitat closed or NSO to oil and gas leasing and mineral entry.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, except fewer acres of special status species habitat would be impacted than under Alternative A: Oil and gas leasing would include 389,521 acres of special status species habitat closed or NSO to oil and gas leasing and mineral entry..	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, except fewer acres of special status species habitat would be impacted than under Alternative A: Oil and gas leasing would include 169,142 acres of special status species habitat closed or NSO to oil and gas leasing and mineral entry..
Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	No impacts to special status species as non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics are not protected under this alternative.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Long-term, beneficial impacts to species from restricted surface disturbances to habitat within 582,357 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	Same as Alternative E, except managed for 5 units that protect wilderness characteristics.
Paleontology	No impacts to special status species.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Recreation	Long-term, adverse impacts from human presence, noise, and surface disturbance associated with mechanized and dispersed recreation on 361,972 acres of federally listed species habitat within	Long-term, adverse impacts same as Alternative A, except with increased protection for special status species and 180,032 fewer acres of federally listed species habitat within SRMAs than under	Long-term, adverse impacts on TES species would be similar to Alternative A. Approximately 5% fewer visitors would be allowed in SRMAs and camping would be limited to designated areas in	Long-term, adverse impacts same as Alternative A, except this alternative would have the most acres of potential special status species habitat subject to adverse impacts from recreation.	Same as Alternative B.	The impacts to TES species would be the same as under Alternative C.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	SRMAs.	Alternative A. In addition, approximately 25% fewer visitors would be allowed in SRMAs than under Alternative A.	more SRMAs than under Alternative A.	Adverse impacts would be greater than Alternative A, even with 184,576 fewer acres of federally listed species habitat within SRMAs.		
Riparian Resources	Short-term adverse impacts to special status plant and fish species could occur from vegetation treatments. Long-term beneficial impacts include reduced weeds and restoration of native vegetation.	In addition to the impacts described under Alternative A, this alternative would provide a reduction in adverse impacts on TES species by closing OHV routes in riparian areas, closing areas to livestock grazing, seasonal restrictions, and setting forage use limits.	Impacts same as Alternative B with fewer adverse impacts to special status species and habitats than Alternatives A.	Impacts same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.	Impacts same as Alternative B with fewer adverse impacts to special status species and habitats than Alternatives A.
Socioeconomics	No impacts to special status species.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Soil and Water Resources	Adverse impacts include habitat loss or degradation from erosion in upland habitats, and sedimentation and contamination of special status fish habitats. Alternative A would have the greatest potential for adverse impacts on special status species habitat due to limited surface disturbance restrictions on steep	Impacts same as Alternative A, except surface-disturbing activities would be prohibited on slopes >40%, with erosion control measure required on 21 to 40% slopes. Impacts would be less than Alternative A.	Impacts same as Alternative A, with greater potential for adverse impacts on slopes >40% than Alternatives B and E. Impacts would be less than Alternatives A and D.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except surface-disturbing activities would be prohibited on slopes >40%, with erosion control measure required on 21 to 40% slopes. Impacts would be less than Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B, except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, as unavailable for OHV use, as ROW exclusion areas, as unavailable for disposal of mineral materials and woodland harvest, and would be managed as VRM Class I, and as proposed for	Same as Alternative C.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	slopes.				withdrawal from mineral entry.	
Special Designations	Beneficial impacts within 492,077 acres designated as ACECs, with long-term adverse impacts on areas available to mineral leasing within ACECs, and impacts associated with permitted woodland harvesting, open OHV use, livestock grazing, and vegetation treatments.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except 521,142 acres of designated ACECs with fewer acres available for oil and gas leasing than Alternative A. Overall fewer impacts than Alternative A due to more acres subject to surface disturbance restrictions.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except 76,764 acres of designated ACECs with fewer acres available for oil and gas leasing than Alternative A. Overall greater impacts than Alternative A due to fewer acres subject to surface disturbance restrictions.	No acres designated as ACECs and limited restrictions on surface disturbances to special status species habitat. Overall greater impacts than Alternatives A, B, C and E.	Same as Alternative B.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except 74,429 acres of designated ACECs with fewer acres available for oil and gas leasing than Alternative A. Overall greater impacts than Alternative A due to fewer acres subject to surface disturbance restrictions.
Special Status Species	Long-term, beneficial impacts on species from restrictions, protective measures, and spatial and seasonal buffers to preserve species habitat.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except Alternative B would provide more acres of protected habitat for special status species.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except Alternative C would provide more acres of protected habitat for special status species than Alternative A.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except Alternative D would protect the fewest acres of special status species habitat from surface disturbance with greater potential impacts than any of the alternatives.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Travel Management	Adverse impacts include surface and noise disturbance, crushing of individual plants and animals, habitat, and introduction of invasive species. Adverse impacts would be reduced by the closure of 276,430 acres to	Impacts same as Alternative A, except 147,268 acres more closed to OHV use than Alternative A and fewer associated adverse impacts to special status species and their habitat.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except 142,237 acres more closed to OHV use than Alternative A.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except no acres closed to OHV use and the greatest potential long-term adverse impacts to special status species from travel of any of the Alternatives.	Same as Alternative B.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except 117,465 acres more closed to OHV use than Alternative A and fewer associated adverse impacts to special status species and their habitat.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	OHV use. Beneficial impacts from fewer miles of available OHV trails due to reduced potential for habitat fragmentation.					
Vegetation	Short-term adverse impacts include trampling and removal of habitat, and collection of sensitive plant species on 15,475 acres open to vegetation treatments per year. Beneficial impacts from habitat improvements and control of invasive and weedy species.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, except 7,875 (51%) fewer acres of vegetation treatments per year, and greater beneficial impacts on species and habitat due to treatment of specific vegetation communities compared to unfocused treatment under Alternative A.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, except to a lesser degree due to 6,175 (40%) fewer acres of vegetation treatments per year. Long-term beneficial impacts would be less than Alternative A due to unfocused treatments occurring on fewer acres.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, except to a lesser degree due to 4,175 (27%) fewer acres of vegetation treatments per year. Long-term beneficial impacts would be greater than under Alternatives B or C due to more targeted vegetation treatments.	Same as Alternative B, except 582,357 acres would have restrictions on vegetation treatments, with fewer short-term adverse impacts than Alternative A, and more long-term beneficial impacts due to habitat protection for special status species.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, except to a lesser degree due to 4,175 (27%) fewer acres of vegetation treatments per year. Long-term beneficial impacts would be greater than under Alternatives B or C due to more targeted vegetation treatments.
Visual Resources	Under Alternative A 726,687 acres would be subject to VRM Class I or II restrictions, with long-term beneficial impacts to special status species due to restrictions on surface-disturbing activities.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except 21,622 (3%) more acres subject to VRM Class I or II restrictions, and greater protection from surface-disturbing activities than Alternative A.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except 169,507 (23%) less acres subject to VRM Class I or II restrictions and less protection from surface-disturbing activities than Alternative A.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except 327,426 (45%) less acres subject to VRM Class I or II restrictions, and the least protection from surface-disturbing activities of the alternatives	Impacts same as Alternative A, except 383,161 (53%) more acres subject to VRM Class I or II restrictions than Alternative A and the greatest protection for special status species habitats.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except 75,657 (10%) more acres subject to VRM Class I or II restrictions than Alternative A and greater protection for special status species and habitats.
Wildlife and Fisheries Resources	Long-term, beneficial impacts from seasonal restrictions in migratory bird habitat, and maintenance and improvements to riparian, wetland, and desert scrub habitats.	Long-term, beneficial impacts same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree because 558,041 acres of special status species habitat would have seasonal restrictions for big	Long-term, beneficial impacts same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree because 326,804 acres of special status species habitat would have seasonal restrictions for big	Long-term, beneficial impacts same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree because 341,637 acres of special status species habitat would have seasonal restrictions	Same as Alternative B.	Long-term, beneficial impacts same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree because 447,024 acres of special status species habitat would have seasonal restrictions for big

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	Long-term, beneficial impacts on 249,651 acres of special status species habitat due to seasonal restrictions for big game.	game, and more acres would be subject to special wildlife conditions than under Alternative A.	game, and more acres would be subject to special wildlife conditions than under Alternative A.	for big game, and more acres would be subject to special wildlife conditions than under Alternative A.		game, and more acres would be subject to special wildlife conditions than under Alternative A.
Woodlands	Adverse impacts include removal or alteration of habitat, noise, trampling and crushing during harvesting, and surface disturbance. Beneficial impacts from reduced potential for wildfire and enhancement of understory habitats. 1,309,894 acres would be open to woodland harvest and wood gathering and pose the greatest potential disturbance to special status species in woodland habitats.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except to a lesser degree due to 730,075 (56% fewer) acres open to woodland harvest and wood gathering, and fewer potential long-term benefits from wildfire reduction than Alternative A.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except to a lesser degree due to 841,938 (36% fewer) acres open to woodland harvest and wood gathering, and fewer potential long-term benefits from wildfire reduction than Alternative A.	Same as Alternative C.	Same as Alternative B with additional protections on 582,357 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, which would be closed to woodland harvesting and wood gathering, and provide reduced surface disturbances in special status species habitat.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except to a lesser degree due to 837,939 acres (36% fewer) acres open to woodland harvest and wood gathering, and fewer potential long-term benefits from wildfire reduction than Alternative A.
TRAVEL MANAGEMENT						
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Air Quality	Minor, short-term adverse impacts from reroutes or travel delays for dust abatement.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Cultural Resources	Long-term, adverse impacts from closure of 500 feet of the McLoyd Canyon-	Long-term, adverse impacts from OHV exclusion from Tank Bench and from the	Impacts in Tank Bench same as Alternative B.	Long-term, beneficial impacts to travel from access to Tank Bench and McLoyd	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B for Tank Bench and McLoyd Canyon-

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	Moon House spur road.	McLoyd Canyon-Moon House access road closure.	Impacts on travel in McLoyd Canyon-Moon House same as Alternative B.	Canyon-Moon House.		Moon House.
Fire Management	Short-term, minor, adverse impacts from route closures from prescribed burns or other wildland fire suppression.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Lands and Realty	Minor, beneficial, long-term impacts from granting ROWs for minerals leasing (to extend travel routes along spur roads).	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Minerals and Energy Resources	Impacts same as Lands and Realty.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	No impacts to travel management as non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would not be managed or protected under this alternative.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Long-term, adverse impacts to travel and access as 582,360 acres and 179 miles of D-Class routes would be closed to OHV travel.	Long term adverse, minor impacts from managing 88,871 acres as limited to designated routes for OHV travel.
Recreation	Long-term, adverse impacts from travel access restrictions within the San Juan River SRMA between Comb Wash and Lime Creek.	Long-term, adverse impacts from travel access restrictions within the San Juan River SRMA between Comb Wash and Lime Creek. Short-term, adverse impacts from seasonal prohibitions on commercial OHV travel within crucial	Impacts along San Juan River SRMA same as Alternative B. Seasonal commercial prohibitions on travel in crucial wildlife habitat same as Alternative B.	Impacts along San Juan River SRMA same as Alternative B. Negligible impacts on travel within wildlife habitat.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as B in San Juan SRMA. Same as Alternative C for OHV travel in wildlife habitat.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

		wildlife habitat.				
Riparian Resources	Negligible impacts from actions that would not specifically restrict travel through riparian areas.	Short-term, adverse impacts from temporary travel closures until restoration of riparian PFC. Long-term, adverse impacts from closure if travel activities were determined to be causing riparian degradation.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Special Designations	Impacts same as discussed under Recreation, Travel, and Riparian for OHV and road travel.	Impacts same as discussed under Recreation, Travel, and Riparian for OHV and road travel.	Impacts same as discussed under Recreation, Travel, and Riparian for OHV and road travel.	Impacts same as discussed under Recreation, Travel, and Riparian for OHV and road travel.	Impacts same as discussed under Recreation, Travel, and Riparian for OHV and road travel.	Impacts same as discussed under Recreation, Travel, and Riparian for OHV and road travel.
Special Status Species	Impacts same as discussed under Recreation and Riparian.	Impacts same as discussed under Recreation and Riparian.	Impacts same as discussed under Recreation and Riparian.	Impacts same as discussed under Recreation and Riparian.	Impacts same as discussed under Recreation and Riparian.	Impacts same as discussed under Recreation and Riparian.
Travel Management, OHV	Long-term, beneficial impacts from designated Open OHV (611,310 acres) and Limited to Designated or existing routes travel areas, and access to Arch Canyon. Adverse impacts to OHV use on 276,430 acres in Closed areas.	Long-term, adverse impacts from no designated Open OHV areas, and Arch Canyon closure to OHV travel, and 423,698 acres Closed to OHV use.	Similar to Alternative B, except beneficial impacts from 2,311 acres designated Open to OHV use. Adverse impacts to travel from 418,667 acres Closed to OHV use.	Minor impacts on travel from no OHV Closed areas, and OHV access to Arch Canyon. Beneficial impacts from 2,311 acres designated Open to OHV use.	Same as Alternative B, except 582,360 acres within non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be Closed to OHV travel. Adverse impacts to travel from a total of 970,436 acres Closed to OHV travel, and no areas designated as Open to OHV travel.	Adverse impacts from closing 393,895 acres to OHV use. Impacts on travel within Arch Canyon same as Alternative A.
Travel Management, Non-mechanized	Long-term, beneficial impacts from no restrictions on non-mechanized travel,	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	and travel opportunities that exclude motorized and mountain biking travel to reduce user conflicts.					
Travel Management, Roads	Negligible impacts to travel from no road closures, and unrestricted travel along B- and D-Class roads.	Long-term, adverse impacts from 15 miles of B- and 780 miles of D-Class road closures to resolve resource use conflicts.	Long-term, adverse impacts from 17 miles of B- and 316 miles of D-Class road closures to resolve resource use conflicts.	Long-term, adverse, minor impacts from 17 miles of B- and 45 miles of D-Class road closures to resolve resource use conflicts.	Same as Alternative B, except decisions for the 582,360 acres within non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would close 179 miles of D-Class roads.	Same as Alternative C. Beneficial impacts from allowed OHV travel along designated routes in the 88,871 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.
Travel Management, Scenic Byways and Backways	Long-term, beneficial impacts from management for high-quality travel opportunities along these routes.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Vegetation	Same impacts as discussed under Fire Management because treatments are the same.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Wildlife and Fisheries Resources	Negligible to minor impacts from lack of restrictions on travel except for restrictions on cross-country OHV travel within bighorn sheep crucial habitat.	Short-term, adverse impacts from seasonal restrictions in wildlife crucial habitat for commercial and permitted travel. No impacts on private travel.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Woodlands	Negligible impacts on travel from unspecified actions.	Short-term, adverse impacts on commercial OHV use from route closures to	Same as Alternative B, to protect cultural and other sensitive resources.	Same as Alternative B, to protect cultural and other sensitive resources.	Long-term, adverse impacts from prohibitions on OHV road travel within	Same as Alternative B, with additional minor impacts on travel within non-WSA

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

		protect wildlife species.			areas with non-WSA wilderness characteristics and from prohibitions on woodland harvesting.	lands with wilderness characteristics
VEGETATION						
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Air Quality	No impacts to vegetation resources.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Cultural Resources	Long-term, adverse impacts of cultural resource decisions on vegetation would be partially mitigated by closure of the Grand Gulch Special Emphasis area to surface-disturbing activities such as woodland harvesting, mineral leasing, OHV use, and mechanized or mechanical surface disturbance (including vegetation treatments). These restrictions would limit vegetation-harming surface disturbance associated with these activities on 37,387 acres.	Fewer short- and long-term adverse impacts than under Alternatives A, C or D, due to restrictions on surface-disturbing activities on 62,567 acres of designated CSMA's. This alternative would have fewer adverse impacts on vegetation than Alternatives A, C and D.	Same beneficial surface disturbance restrictions and impacts as under Alternative B, except some CSMA's would have fewer restrictions on surface-disturbing activities than Alternatives B and E, but greater restrictions than Alternatives A and D. This alternative would have fewer short- and long-term adverse impacts than Alternative A and D, but more than Alternatives B and E.	Same impacts as Alternative C, except fewer areas would be managed as CSMA's. Overall, this alternative would have fewer short- and long-term adverse impacts than Alternative A, but more than Alternatives B, C and E.	Same as B, except more short- and long-term beneficial impacts from vegetation resource preservation within Comb Ridge to preserve non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	Same as Alternative C, except that two SRMA's and two MZs within the Cedar Mesa SRMA would be established. Adverse impacts to vegetation from surface disturbance under the Proposed Plan would be greater than under Alternatives B and C but less than under Alternative A.
Fire Management	Surface-disturbing fuels treatments on 5,000 to 10,000 acres/year would have long-term beneficial and short-term adverse impacts	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	on vegetation communities in treated areas. Thinning vegetation and treating areas for weeds would benefit vegetation by removing competition from weedy natives and invasive species. Short-term, adverse impacts include trampling and crushing of individual plants during treatment.					
Health and Safety	No impacts to vegetation resources.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Lands and Realty	Under Alternative A, construction of roads, pipelines, wind power generators, solar power generators, and communication towers would result in adverse impacts to vegetation from removal of individual plants and other surface disturbances, which can lead to the introduction of weedy plant species. 132,380 acres would be withdrawn from mineral entry, while 120,800 acres and 253,790 acres would be exclusion and avoidance areas, respectively, for	There would be fewer adverse impacts on vegetation resources under this alternative than Alternative A due to restrictions on ROWs for wind and solar energy development in WSAs, WSR corridors, VRM Class I and II areas, ACECs, raptor and migratory bird habitat, and special status species habitat. Overall, Alternative B would have fewer adverse impacts on vegetation resources than Alternatives A, C or D. 251,710 acres would be withdrawn	Adverse impacts would be same as under Alternative A due to increased surface disturbance associated with ROWs in ACECs, VRM Class II and III areas, and non-federally listed sensitive species habitat. Overall, Alternative C would have fewer impacts on vegetation resources than Alternatives A and D, but more than B and E. 121,912 acres would be withdrawn from mineral entry, while 395,329 acres and 39,323 acres	Alternative D would have greater adverse impacts on vegetation resources than Alternative A due to more acres of surface disturbance associated with ROWs than would occur under any of the other alternatives. 46,131 acres would be withdrawn from mineral entry, while 386,853 acres and 14,175 acres would be exclusion and avoidance areas, respectively, for ROWs.	Same impacts as Alternative B, except ROWs would be prohibited in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, which would reduce long-term, adverse impacts to vegetation more than any of the other alternatives. 834,070 acres would be withdrawn from mineral entry, while 974,463 acres and 53,915 acres would be exclusion and avoidance areas, respectively, for ROWs.	Impacts would be similar to the alternatives except that 50,665 acres would be withdrawn from mineral entry, while 416,115 acres and 133,293 acres would be exclusion and avoidance areas, respectively, for ROWs.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	ROWs.	from mineral entry, while 416,612 acres and 125,105 acres would be exclusion and avoidance areas, respectively, for ROWs.	would be exclusion and avoidance areas, respectively, for ROWs.			
Livestock Grazing	Beneficial impacts from 17,300 acres allotted to wildlife on the slopes of Peter's Canyon and East Canyon, which would help maintain native vegetation in those areas due to the lower grazing impact of lower numbers of wildlife than livestock.	Same impacts as Alternative A, except allotment closures would exclude more acreage from grazing than any of the other alternatives, which would have long-term, beneficial impacts on native vegetation in excluded areas.	Same as Alternative B, except the Mule Canyon Allotment south of U-95 would be unavailable. This alternative would have similar impacts as Alternative B, and lower impacts than Alternative A.	Alternative D would have the smallest area excluded from grazing and, therefore greater adverse impacts to vegetation.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative C.
Minerals and Energy Resources	Approximately 73 wells drilled (701 acres of surface disturbance), 886 acres of short-term impacts from geophysical exploration, and infrastructure construction with direct adverse impacts on vegetation. There would be approximately 851 acres of surface disturbance total for 15 years as a result of uranium, vanadium, placer gold, limestone, sand and gravel, building	Impacts would be the same as Alternative A, except there would be approximately 66 wells and 634 acres of disturbance (10% fewer acres than under Alternative A), and 794 acres of adverse impacts from geophysical exploration (10% fewer acres than under Alternative A). Acres of disturbance for uranium, vanadium, placer gold, limestone, sand and gravel, building stone, and clay activities would be the same as under	Impacts would be the same as Alternative A, except there would be approximately 74 wells and 710 acres of disturbance (1% more than under Alternative A), and 904 acres of adverse impacts from geophysical exploration (2% more than under Alternative A). Acres of disturbance for uranium, vanadium, placer gold, limestone, sand and gravel, building stone, and clay activities would be the same as under Alternative A.	Impacts would be the same as Alternative A, except there would be approximately 75 wells and 720 acres (2% more than under Alternative A), and 924 acres of surface disturbance from geophysical exploration (4% more than under Alternative A). Acres of disturbance for uranium, vanadium, placer gold, limestone, sand and gravel, building stone, and clay activities would be the same as under	Same as Alternative B, except for long term, beneficial impacts from mineral leasing prohibitions on 582,357 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. Alternative E would have the most acres closed or NSO to oil and gas leasing, and the least negative impacts on vegetation resources of the alternatives. Acres of disturbance for uranium, vanadium, placer gold, limestone, sand and gravel, building stone, and	Impacts would be the same as Alternative A, except there would be approximately 72 wells and 688 acres (2% less than under Alternative A), and 904 acres of surface disturbance from geophysical exploration (2% more than under Alternative A). Acres of disturbance for uranium, vanadium, placer gold, limestone, sand and gravel, building stone, and clay activities would be the same as under Alternative A. Overall, the Proposed

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	stone, and clay activities. Overall, the second fewest number of acres of native vegetation would be impacted by minerals development under this alternative.	Alternative A. Alternative B would have fewer adverse impacts than Alternative A and greater impacts than Alternative E.	Overall, this alternative would have greater adverse impacts to vegetation than Alternatives A, B and E, and slightly fewer impacts than Alternative D.	Alternative A. This alternative would have greater adverse impacts to vegetation than any of the alternatives.	clay activities would be the same as under Alternative A.	Plan would have greater adverse impacts to vegetation than Alternative A.
Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	No impacts to vegetation, as non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics are not protected under this alternative.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Long-term, beneficial impacts from resource preservation on 582,357 acres. Long-term and short-term, adverse impacts from prohibitions on mechanical treatment of vegetation and harvesting to reduce fire risks and invasive species spread.	Same as Alternative E, except 5 units (88,871 acres) would be managed to protect their wilderness characteristics.
Paleontology	Short-term adverse impacts on vegetation due to trampling.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Recreation	Alternative A would have the second most acres of native vegetation subject to adverse impacts associated with recreation activities of the alternatives and the Proposed Plan.	Alternative B would have the fewest user/days per year and number of visitors per day of the alternatives and the Proposed Plan, which would reduce trampling of native vegetation and introduction of weedy plant species associated with human presence. This alternative would have greater long-term, beneficial	Impacts same as Alternative B, but to a less beneficial degree, due to fewer restrictions on surface disturbances to vegetation.	Same impacts as C, but to a less beneficial degree due to fewer restrictions on surface disturbances to vegetation.	Same impacts as Alternative B, except protection of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would beneficially limit or prohibit surface disturbances to vegetation within SRMAs. This alternative would have the least impacts on vegetation of the alternatives and the Proposed Plan.	Impacts same as Alternative C except that group size limits would be greater in Cedar Mesa and Dark Canyon SRMAs and special Management Zones would be established in Comb Ridge, Beef Basin, and McLoyd Canyon-Moonhouse within the Cedar Mesa SRMA.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

		impacts and fewer adverse impacts on vegetation than any of the other alternatives and the Proposed Plan.				
Riparian Resources	Vegetation treatments would have both beneficial and adverse impacts on vegetation in riparian habitat. Beneficial impacts would include reduction of weed populations and the restoration of diverse native vegetation. Adverse impacts would include crushing and removal of native vegetation during the treatment process.	If determined to be the cause, OHV routes in selected riparian areas would be closed if riparian areas are found to be Functioning at Risk. In addition, some riparian areas would be unavailable for grazing, while others would be subject to seasonal restrictions and forage utilization limits if found to be Functioning At Risk. These restrictions would reduce adverse impacts to riparian vegetation. This alternative would have fewer impacts on vegetation than Alternatives A and D.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B, except surface-disturbing activities would be limited or prohibited in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. This alternative would have the greatest beneficial impacts and least adverse impacts on riparian vegetation of the alternatives.	Same as Alternative C.
Socioeconomics	No impacts to vegetation resources.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Soil and Water Resources	Long-term, adverse impacts on vegetation due to limited restrictions on surface disturbances on steep slopes.	Long-term, beneficial impacts on vegetation from prohibitions on surface-disturbing activities on slopes >40%, and erosion control designs and plans for surface-	Long-term, beneficial impacts on vegetation due to restrictions on surface disturbance on slopes >40%, unless it were determined that it would cause undue or	Impacts same as A, but to a less adverse degree due to required plans and erosion control strategies for slopes >40%, which would help mitigate	Same as Alternative B, except surface-disturbing activities would be limited or prohibited in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. This alternative would have	Same as Alternative C.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

		disturbing activities on slopes between 21 and 40%. This alternative would have fewer adverse impacts on vegetation than Alternatives A, C, and D.	unnecessary degradation to pursue other placement alternatives. This alternative would have fewer adverse impacts on vegetation than Alternatives A and D, but greater impacts than Alternatives B and E.	adverse impacts on vegetation located on and down slope from disturbance areas on steep slopes. This alternative would have greater adverse impacts on vegetation than Alternatives B, C, and E, but fewer impacts than Alternative A.	the least adverse impacts on vegetation of the alternatives.	
Special Designations	Long-term, adverse impacts to vegetation within ACECs from surface disturbances related to mineral leasing, geophysical work, mineral material disposal and mineral entry. Other adverse impacts would include woodland harvesting, vegetation treatments, livestock grazing and open OHV use.	The increased number of acres designated as ACECs and decrease in allowable surface-disturbing activities under this alternative would result in fewer long-term, adverse impacts on vegetation resources than would occur under Alternatives A, C, and D.	Alternative C would have limited ACEC designation and more acres subject to surface-disturbing activities than Alternatives A, B, and E, but fewer adverse impacts than Alternative D.	No ACECs would be designated under Alternative D. This alternative would have the greatest long-term, adverse impacts to vegetation from the increase in permitted surface disturbances of any of the alternatives and the Proposed Plan.	Same impacts as Alternative B, except there would be beneficial, long-term impacts on vegetation due to restrictions on surface-disturbing activities in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics within designated ACECs.	The Proposed Plan would designate more acreage as ACECs than Alternatives C and D, but less than Alternatives A, B, and E. Therefore, more acres would be subject to surface-disturbing activities under the Proposed Plan than under Alternatives A, B, and E. However, fewer acres would be subject to these activities than under Alternatives C and D.
Special Status Species	Alternative A would specify acres of protected habitat for special status species, which would also protect vegetation resources. This alternative would provide the least	Alternative B would provide the most acres of protected habitat for special status species, which would indirectly provide protection for vegetation in special status species	Alternative C would provide fewer protected acres of habitat for special status species habitat, and vegetation therein, than Alternatives B and E, but would	Alternative D would provide fewer protected acres of special status species habitat, and the vegetation therein, than Alternatives B, C, and E, but would	Same as Alternative B, except there would be beneficial, long-term impacts on vegetation due to restrictions on surface-disturbing activities in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. This	Same as Alternative B, except that within 0.6 miles of active sage-grouse strutting grounds oil and gas leasing would be subject to NSO restrictions. The construction of power

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	beneficial protection of the alternatives.	habitat. This alternative would provide greater beneficial protections and have the lower adverse impacts on vegetation than Alternatives A, C, and D.	have greater protections in place than Alternatives A and D.	have greater protections in place than Alternative A.	alternative would have the fewest adverse impacts on vegetation of the alternatives.	lines, wind power turbines, or other above ground structures would be avoided within 4 miles of active Gunnison sage-grouse strutting grounds from May 16 - March 19. Overall, the Proposed Plan would result in fewer impacts to vegetation than under Alternative A.
Travel Management	This alternative would have 276,430 acres closed to OHV use. These closures would eliminate OHV related surface disturbance to native vegetation in closed areas.	Alternative B would close 423,582 acres to OHV use, which is 135,502 acres (47%) more than Alternative A. This alternative would have the fewer adverse impacts on vegetation associated with travel than Alternatives A, C, and D.	Alternative C would close 418,549 acres to OHV use, which is 130,469 acres (45%) more than Alternative A. This alternative would have fewer adverse impacts on vegetation associated with travel than Alternatives A and D, but greater impacts than B and E.	This alternative would have no closures to OHV use, which is 276,430 acres less than under Alternative A. This alternative would have the greatest adverse impacts on vegetation from travel of any of the alternatives.	Same as Alternative B, except there would be 582,356 additional acres closed to OHV use in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. This alternative would have the least adverse impacts on vegetation due to 694,006 (251%) more acres closed to OHV use than Alternative A.	The Proposed Plan would close 393,895 acres to OHV use, which is 117,465 acres (42%) more than under Alternative A.
Vegetation	15,475 acres vegetation treatments per year. This alternative would have short-term, adverse impacts on vegetation due to the large acreage open to disturbances associated with widespread, unspecified vegetation	Under Alternative B, 7,600 acres of vegetation treatments/year represent a 51% reduction in annual treatments compared to A. This alternative would provide the least long-term benefits and fewer adverse impacts to vegetation, due to	Impacts same as Alternative B, except 9,300 acres would be treated/year. This alternative would provide greater long-term benefits to vegetation than Alternatives A, B, and E, due to a greater number of acres receiving targeted vegetation treatment.	Under Alternative D, 11,300 acres would be open to vegetation treatments/year with potentially greater long-term beneficial impacts on vegetation resources than would occur under Alternatives A, B, C and E due to a greater number of	Same as Alternative B, except no surface-disturbing land treatments would be permitted in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. This alternative would have the least short-term adverse impacts, but limited long-term benefits to vegetation of the alternatives.	Same as Alternative C.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	treatments. Long-term, beneficial impacts would include reduced competition with exotic species.	targeted treatments over a smaller area, than Alternatives A, C and D.		acres receiving targeted vegetation treatment.		
Visual Resources	Minor, short-term, adverse impacts to vegetation in VRM I and II areas from restrictions on surface disturbance, and long-term, beneficial impacts to vegetation under VRM III and IV objectives. Alternative A would have the smallest area subject to VRM Class I restrictions on surface disturbances and the largest area subject to VRM Class II restrictions of the alternatives.	Impacts same as A, except this alternative would have a larger area subject to VRM Class I surface disturbance restrictions (with long-term, beneficial impacts on vegetation resources under these VRM classes) than Alternative A. Alternative B would have more area subject to VRM III and less area under VRM II and IV restrictions than Alternative A.	Impacts same as A, except this alternative would have a larger area subject to VRM Class I and III surface disturbance restrictions, and a smaller area subject to VRM Class II restrictions than Alternative A. Alternative C would have the largest area subject to class IV restrictions of the alternatives.	Impacts same as A, except this alternative would have a larger area subject to VRM Class I, III and IV restrictions, and a smaller area subject to VRM Class II restrictions than Alternative A. Alternative D would have the largest area subject to VRM Class III restrictions and the second largest areas subject to class IV restrictions of the alternatives.	Same as Alternative B, except additional protection of acreage within non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics under VRM I would have long-term, beneficial impacts on vegetation resources. This alternative would have the most acres managed as VRM I of the alternatives.	The Proposed Plan would designate 422,989 acres as VRM Class I (14% more than under Alternative A). VRM Class II designations would apply to 228,041 acres (35% less than under Alternative A). VRM Class III designations would apply to 507,583 acres (21% more than under Alternative A). Finally, VRM Class IV designations would apply to 623,002 acres (2% less than under Alternative A).
Wildlife and Fisheries Resources	Beneficial impacts on vegetation from habitat protection and mitigation of surface disturbances to vegetation: 247,938 acres subject to bighorn sheep special conditions; 13,954 acres of pronghorn habitat; and 180,089 acres of protected deer winter range.	Beneficial impacts same as A, but to a greater degree due to increased mitigation potential for the adverse impacts of surface-disturbing activities on vegetation resources, including: 83% more acres subject to bighorn sheep special wildlife conditions; 110% more acres of protected pronghorn	Beneficial impacts same as A, but to a greater degree due to increased mitigation potential for the adverse impacts of surface-disturbing activities on vegetation resources, including: 21% more acres subject to bighorn sheep special wildlife conditions; 110% more acres of protected pronghorn	Beneficial impacts same as A, but to a greater degree due to increased mitigation potential for the adverse impacts of surface-disturbing activities on vegetation resources, including: 26% fewer acres subject to bighorn sheep special wildlife conditions; same number of acres of	Same as Alternative B.	Under the Proposed Plan there would be 205,071 more acres subject to bighorn sheep special wildlife conditions, 15,401 more acres of protected pronghorn habitat, 195,803 more protected deer habitat, and 93,104 more acres of elk habitat subject to special conditions than under Alternative

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

		habitat; 330% more protected deer habitat; and 184,248 more acres of protected elk habitat than Alternative A.	habitat; 45% more protected deer habitat; and 93,104 more acres of protected elk habitat than Alternative A.	protected pronghorn habitat; 17% fewer protected deer habitat; and 60,103 more acres of protected elk habitat than Alternative A.		A. Because of these differences, the Proposed Plan would provide greater protection for vegetation resources in the wildlife protection areas of the Monticello FO than Alternative A, but would be more likely to adversely affect vegetation resources than Alternatives B and E.
Woodlands	Short-term, adverse impacts on 1,147,407 acres of the pinyon-juniper vegetation open to woodland harvesting, include trampling and removal of native trees. Long-term, indirect impacts include the potential introduction of weedy, non-native species during wood harvesting operations.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except impacts would be on 504,666 acres of pinyon-juniper vegetation (56% fewer acres open to harvest than Alternative A). This alternative would have the fewest acres open to the adverse impacts of woodland harvest.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except impacts would be on 597,086 acres of pinyon-juniper vegetation open to woodland product harvest (48% fewer acres open to harvest than under Alternative A).	Same as Alternative C.	Same as Alternative B, except that no woodland product harvest would be allowed in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. This would result in the fewest acres open to surface-disturbing activities that would have long term, adverse impacts on vegetation resources.	Same as Alternative C.
VISUAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT						
VRM Class	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
VRM I (Very low impacts to scenic quality allowed)	371,575 acres	497,668 acres	425,179 acres	390,424 acres	998,370 acres	422,989 acres
VRM II (Low impacts to scenic quality)	355,112 acres	250,641 acres	132,001 acres	8,838 acres	111,478 acres	228,041 acres

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

allowed)						
VRM I and II, Combined	726,687 acres	748,309 acres	557,180 acres	399,262 acres	1,109,848 acres	651,030 acres
VRM III and IV, Combined (Moderate to major impacts to scenic quality allowed, short-term and long-term impacts from surface-disturbing activities in VRM III and VRM IV areas).	1,054,681 acres	1,034,813 acres	1,225,915 acres	1,383,860 acres	671,828 acres	1,130,585 acres
Scenic Quality/Viewshed, Lockhart Basin	VRM Class III designation for Lockhart Basin in portions not managed as a Visual ACEC (8,642 acres managed as VRM I in the Indian Creek ACEC). More potential adverse short-term and long-term impacts on 47,783 acres than for the action alternatives	No scenic quality degradation because of management under VRM I for 47,783 acres for Lockhart Basin ACEC	VRM Class II and Class III designation for Lockhart Basin, but not managed as a Visual ACEC, more potential adverse impacts on 47,783 acres than Alternatives B and E, but less than Alternative A.	VRM Class III designation for Lockhart Basin, Not managed as a Visual ACEC, with more potential adverse impacts on 47,783 acres than for Alternatives B, C and E.	No scenic quality degradation because of management under VRM I for 47,783 acres for Lockhart Basin ACEC.	Same as Alternative C.
Scenic Quality/Viewshed, Valley of the Gods	No scenic quality degradation because of VRM I designation for 31,387 acres for Valley of the Gods ACEC	No scenic quality degradation because of VRM I designation for 22,863 acres for Valley of the Gods ACEC	Valley of the Gods designated as VRM I as a Visual ACEC, with no scenic quality degradation for 22,863 acres.	Designation as VRM III, Valley of the Gods is not managed as a Visual ACEC, with more potential adverse impacts on 22,863 acres than for Alternatives A, B, C, and E.	No scenic quality degradation because of VRM I designation for 22,863 acres for Valley of the Gods ACEC.	Same as Alternative B.
Scenic Quality/Viewshed,	No scenic quality degradation because	No scenic quality degradation because	Indian Creek is managed as a Visual	Indian Creek is not managed as a Visual	No scenic quality degradation because	Same as Alternative C.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

Indian Creek	of VRM I designation for 8,510 acres in the Indian Creek ACEC	of VRM I designation on 8,510 acres for Indian Creek ACEC	ACEC, with no scenic quality degradation on 3,908 acres in the ACEC (outside the WSA).	ACEC, designated as VRM III, with more potential adverse impacts on 8,510 acres than for Alternatives A, B, C and E.	of VRM I designation for 8,510 acres for Indian Creek ACEC	
WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES RESOURCES						
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Wildlife and Fisheries Resources	Long-term beneficial impacts to wildlife from seasonal wildlife protection areas: 329,750 acres of bighorn sheep habitat, 12,960 acres pronghorn habitat, and 197,550 acres mule deer habitat (540,260 acres total).	Beneficial impacts same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree, from proposed 453,388 acres of protection areas for bighorn sheep habitat, 29,365 acres pronghorn habitat, 785,921 acres mule deer habitat, and 191,173 acres elk habitat (total of 1,459,847).	Impacts same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree from proposed habitat protection areas: 415,395 (lambling) and 453,390 (rutting) acres for bighorn sheep, 29,365 acres for pronghorn, 266,406 acres for mule deer, and 97,471 acres for elk habitat (total of 808,637 acres).	Beneficial impacts same as Alternative A from proposed seasonal wildlife protection areas: 299,009 acres desert bighorn sheep, 13,961 acres for pronghorn, 182,315 acres for mule deer, and 62,484 acres for elk (total of 557,769 acres subject to special wildlife conditions).	Impacts same as Alternative B.	Beneficial impacts same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree, from proposed 453,388 acres of protection areas for bighorn sheep habitat, 29,365 acres pronghorn habitat, 383,098 acres mule deer habitat, and 97,471 acres elk habitat (total of 963,322 acres is more than A, but less than E).
Cultural Resources	Long-term adverse impacts of cultural resource decisions on wildlife resources from restrictions on habitat improvements, watershed improvements, and vegetation treatments. Beneficial impacts on wildlife from restrictions on	Beneficial impacts same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree, due to greater restrictions on surface-disturbing activities.	Beneficial impacts same as Alternative A, except woodland gathering and harvesting, and vegetation treatments would be allowed. Alternative C would have fewer adverse impacts on wildlife than Alternative A due to greater restrictions on	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree, and beneficial impacts to a lesser degree than Alternative A.	Impacts same as Alternative B, but to a greater degree due to increased restrictions on surface-disturbing activities.	Beneficial impacts same as Alternative A, except that surface-disturbing activities such as woodland gathering and harvesting, and vegetation treatments would be allowed. The Proposed Plan would have fewer adverse impacts on wildlife than

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	surface-disturbing activities including woodland gathering and harvesting, minerals leasing, and OHV use and restrictions on visitor numbers and activities.		surface-disturbing activities.			Alternative A due to greater restrictions on surface-disturbing activities.
Fire Management	Fuels treatments would have short-term adverse impacts to wildlife species from habitat disturbance and removal, and long-term beneficial impacts due to reduced fuel loading, reduced fire risk, and diversified habitat.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Lands and Realty	Lands and realty decisions would result in adverse surface disturbance, causing loss of wildlife habitat, habitat fragmentation, direct disturbance to wildlife during construction and maintenance, potentially introduce invasive species, and/or wildlife to avoid areas that were previously considered viable habitat. Beneficial impacts would include areas excluded from surface-disturbing	Impacts same as Alternative A, except that Alternative B would exclude more areas from wind or solar energy exploration and development, thereby having fewer adverse impacts than Alternative A. Under Alternative B 416,612 acres would be ROW exclusion areas, while 125,105 acres would be ROW avoidance areas. 251,710 acres would be withdrawn from	Impacts same as Alternative B, except that fewer areas would be excluded from wind or solar energy exploration and development. Under Alternative C 395,329 acres would be ROW exclusion areas, while 39,323 acres would be ROW avoidance areas. 121,912 acres would be withdrawn from mineral entry.	Impacts same as Alternative B, except fewer exclusions from wind or solar energy exploration and development. Alternative D would result in more adverse impacts to wildlife in the short- and long-term than any other alternative. Under Alternative D 386,853 acres would be ROW exclusion areas, while 14,175 acres would be ROW avoidance areas. 46,131 acres would be withdrawn	Impacts same as Alternative B, except that non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would also be excluded from ROWs for wind or solar energy exploration and development. Alternative E would be more beneficial to wildlife than all other alternatives since it prescribes more exclusions than any other alternative. Under Alternative E 974,463 acres would be ROW exclusion	Under the Proposed Plan the impacts of lands and realty decisions on wildlife and fisheries resources would be the same as under Alternatives A, B, C, D, and E except that 416,115 acres would be ROW exclusion areas, while 133,293 acres would be ROW avoidance areas. 50,665 acres would be withdrawn from mineral entry.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	activities and mitigation measures that accompany surface-disturbing activities. Under Alternative A 120,800 acres would be ROW exclusion areas, while 253,790 acres would be ROW avoidance areas. 132,380 acres would be withdrawn from mineral entry.	mineral entry.		from mineral entry.	areas, while 53,915 acres would be ROW avoidance areas. 834,070 acres would be withdrawn from mineral entry.	
Livestock Grazing	The exclusion of livestock from sensitive habitats (such as riparian areas and zones with limited soils) would beneficially impact wildlife species by maintaining more native plant forage and cover. Where livestock grazing is allowed there would be adverse long-term impacts on wildlife due to competition with wildlife for forage, possible trampling of individual animals or nests, and susceptibility to invasion by noxious weeds. Under all alternatives grazing would continue to be excluded from 118,424 acres, and 17,300 acres in	Alternative B prescribes the largest area unavailable for livestock grazing and therefore would have the greatest beneficial impacts on native vegetation and wildlife habitat.	Alternative C is the same as Alternative B, except that Mule Canyon would be open to grazing north of U-95. Alternative C would have fewer adverse impacts to wildlife than Alternative A, but greater impacts than Alternatives B and E.	Alternative D is the same as Alternative B, except fewer acres would be unavailable to grazing, but with greater restrictions on grazing than Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative C.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	Peter's Canyon and East Canyon would be allotted to wildlife.					
Minerals and Energy Resources	Surface disturbance due to mineral development would degrade and fragment wildlife habitat, and displace wildlife. Leasable mineral development would impact 699 acres of primarily pinyon-juniper and desert shrub habitats, 886 acres of wildlife habitats adversely impacted by geophysical exploration in the short term, and 1,652,743 acres open to locatable minerals activities under standard stipulations.	Impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree. Leasable mineral development would adversely impact 636 acres of primarily pinyon-juniper and desert shrub habitats, 794 acres of wildlife habitats adversely impacted in the short term by geophysical exploration, and 1,521,656 acres open to locatable minerals activities under standard stipulations.	Impacts same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree, from leasable mineral development that would impact 710 acres of primarily pinyon-juniper and desert shrub habitats, 903 acres of wildlife habitats temporarily impacted by geophysical exploration, and by 1,637,688 acres open to locatable minerals activities under standard stipulations.	Impacts same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree, from leasable mineral development that would impact 721 acres of primarily pinyon-juniper and desert shrub habitats, 924 acres of wildlife habitats temporarily impacted by geophysical exploration, and 1,737,999 acres open to locatable minerals activities under standard stipulations.	Impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree, from leasable mineral development that would impact 518 acres of primarily pinyon-juniper and desert shrub habitats, 591 acres of wildlife habitats temporarily impacted by geophysical exploration, and 1,521,656 acres open to locatable minerals activities under standard stipulations.	Impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree, from leasable mineral development that would impact 688 acres of primarily pinyon-juniper and desert shrub habitats. Impacts would be to a greater degree due to: 903 acres of wildlife habitats temporarily impacted by geophysical exploration, and 1,734,458 acres open to locatable minerals activities under standard stipulations.
Recreation	Adverse impacts to wildlife species and their habitats from recreation, include noise disturbance, vehicle traffic, trampling of native vegetation, and other human-related disturbances. Where designated, SRMAs would reduce adverse impacts to wildlife by restricting recreation or reducing dispersed	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree due to greater restrictions on surface-disturbing activities in SRMAs.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree, due to greater restrictions on surface-disturbing activities in SRMAs.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree, due to fewer restrictions on surface-disturbing activities. Overall, this alternative would have the most acres of native vegetation and potential wildlife habitat subject to adverse impacts associated with	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree, due to greater restrictions on surface-disturbing activities. Overall, Alternative E would be most beneficial to wildlife because it prescribes the greatest restrictions, of all alternatives and the Proposed Plan, on surface-disturbing activities.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree, due to greater restrictions on surface-disturbing activities in SRMAs.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	recreational activities.			recreation activities.		
Riparian Resources	Under all alternatives riparian areas would be managed as NSO for oil and gas leasing but open to mineral entry and disposal of mineral materials (though not in active floodplains or within 100 meters of riparian areas). Livestock grazing would be allowed in riparian areas under all alternatives. The long-term adverse impacts of these activities would be mitigated by management in accordance with laws, executive orders, and regulations on floodplains and wetlands.	Impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree, due to prescriptions limiting OHV use, livestock grazing, and motorized camping.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Soil and Water Resources	Under all alternatives, soils and watershed decisions would comply with Utah's Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing and Recreation. All floodplains and riparian/wetlands would be managed in accordance with Executive Order 11988. There would	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree since unavoidable surface-disturbance on slopes between 21 and 40% would require a plan (with an erosion control strategy and approved survey and design). Also, surface-disturbing activities would not be permitted on slopes	Adverse impacts same as Alternative B and E, but to a greater degree since surface-disturbing activities would not be permitted on slopes greater than 40% unless it determined that it would cause undue or unnecessary degradation to pursue other placement alternatives.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree since surface-disturbing activities would not be ruled out for slopes of any grade and a plan would only be required for slopes greater than 40%. This alternative would have more adverse impacts on vegetation resources	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative C.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	be no slope restrictions on allowable disturbance under Alternative A.	greater than 40% (excluding 87,599 acres of land in the Monticello PA).	Unavoidable surface-disturbing activities on slopes between 21 and 40% would require a plan (with an erosion control strategy and approved survey and design).	and therefore wildlife resources than any other alternative.		
Special Designations	<p>The designation of ACECs and WSR segments would have long-term beneficial impacts on wildlife species and their habitats because ACECs and WSR segments limit or prohibit surface-disturbing activities, decreasing the potential for damage to native vegetation or avoidance behavior in individual animals.</p> <p>The designation of ACECs and WSR segments would also have long-term adverse impacts on wildlife where protective management prohibits habitat or watershed improvements or vegetation treatments.</p> <p>Under Alternative A, 10 of the 12 proposed</p>	Beneficial impacts same as Alternative A but to a greater degree since all 12 of the proposed ACECs would be designated and managed as ACECs and all 12 river segments reviewed for WSR status would be recommended as suitable.	Beneficial impacts same as Alternative A but to a lesser extent since 7 of the 12 proposed ACECs would be designated and managed as ACECs and 4 of the 12 river segments reviewed for WSR status would be recommended as suitable.	<p>Under Alternative D none of the ACECs would be designated and managed as ACECs and none of the river segments reviewed for WSR status would be recommended as suitable.</p> <p>Alternative D would result in more adverse impacts to wildlife than any other alternative and the Proposed Plan since there are fewer restrictions on surface-disturbing activities under this alternative.</p>	Same as Alternative B.	Beneficial impacts same as Alternative A but to a lesser extent since 7 of the 12 proposed ACECs would be designated and managed as ACECs and 4 of the 12 river segments reviewed for WSR status would be recommended as suitable.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	ACECs would continue to be managed as ACECs and 6 of 12 river segments reviewed for WSR status would be recommended as suitable.					
Special Status Species	Under all alternatives no management actions would be permitted on public lands that would jeopardize the continued existence of plant or animal species that are listed, officially proposed, or candidates for listing as Threatened or Endangered and the BLM would commit to current and future conservation agreements, management plans, and recovery plans. These actions would have long-term beneficial impacts on wildlife that share habitat with targeted special status species.	Beneficial impacts same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree since Alternative B would provide more acres of protected habitat for special status species than any other alternative and the Proposed Plan.	Beneficial impacts same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree since Alternative C would provide more acres of protected habitat for special status species than Alternative A (but fewer acres than Alternatives B and E).	Beneficial impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree since Alternative D would provide the fewest number of acres of surface disturbance restrictions in special status species habitat, resulting in a greater potential for adverse impacts on wildlife in special status species habitat.	Same as Alternative B.	Beneficial impacts same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree since the Proposed Plan would provide more acres of protected habitat for special status species than Alternative A (but fewer acres than Alternatives B, C, and E).
Travel Management	OHV use has short- and long-term adverse impacts on wildlife by causing damage to vegetation used as wildlife	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a much lesser degree. Under Alternative B: zero acres would be	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree. Under Alternative C: 2,311 acres would be	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree. Under Alternative D: 2,311 acres would	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a much lesser degree. Under Alternative E: zero acres would be open to OHV use;	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree. Under the Proposed Plan: 0 acres would

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	forage and cover, as well as causing noise. Habitat fragmentation and degradation and the spread of noxious weeds also result from OHV use. Under Alternative A: 611,310 acres would be open to OHV use; 540,260 acres would be limited to designated routes with seasonal restrictions; 570,390 would be limited to existing roads and trails; 218,780 acres would be limited to designated roads and trails; and 276,430 acres would be closed to OHV use.	open to OHV use; 1,359,417 acres would be limited to designated routes; and 423,698 acres would be closed to OHV use.	open to OHV use; 1,362,142 acres would be limited to designated routes; and 418,667 acres would be closed to OHV use. Designated 'ways' would be established in corridors leading to trailheads.	be open to OHV use; 1,780,807 acres would be limited to designated routes; and 0 acres would be closed to OHV use.	812,679 acres would be limited to designated routes; and 970,436 acres would be closed to OHV use.	be open to OHV use; 1,388,191 acres would be limited to designated routes, and 393,895 acres would be closed to OHV use. Designated 'ways' would be established in corridors leading to trailheads.
Vegetation	Under Alternative A, 15,475 acres would be open to vegetation treatments each year. This is substantially greater than under any of the other alternatives. There are more short-term adverse impacts associated with Alternative A because of the large number of acres open to trampling and disturbance associated with widespread, less	Under Alternative B, 7,600 acres would be open to vegetation treatments each year, which is 51% fewer acres of treatment than under Alternative A. Overall, this alternative is likely to have more beneficial short-term impacts on wildlife and habitat than Alternative A due to fewer, short-term, adverse impacts associated with habitat disturbance, and the	Impacts same as Alternative B, but to a greater degree. Under Alternative C, 9,300 acres would be open to vegetation treatments each year, which is 40% fewer acres of treatment than under Alternative A.	Impacts same as Alternative B, but to a greater degree. Under Alternative D, 11,300 acres would be open to vegetation treatments each year, which is 27% fewer acres of treatment than under Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative C.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	targeted, vegetation treatments, and seed gathering and plant collection activities.	increased likelihood of successful vegetation treatments due to the concentration of efforts in specified vegetation communities outlined under this alternative.				
Visual Resource Management	<p>VRM Classes I and II are generally more beneficial to wildlife since they result in less surface disturbance than VRM Classes III and IV. However, in some cases VRM Class I or II can have adverse impacts on wildlife by limiting or prohibiting habitat and watershed improvements and vegetation treatments.</p> <p>Under Alternative A: VRM Class I: 371,575 acres (21%) VRM Class II: 355,112 acres (20%) VRM Class III: 416,806 acres (23%) VRM Class IV: 637,875 acres (36%)</p>	<p>Impacts same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree, due to increased acreage managed as VRM Classes I and II.</p> <p>Under Alternative B: VRM Class I: 497,668 acres (28%) VRM Class II: 250,641 acres (14%) VRM Class III: 426,350 acres (24%) VRM Class IV: 608,463 acres (34%)</p>	<p>Impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree due to decreased acreage managed as VRM Class II.</p> <p>Under Alternative C: VRM Class I: 425,179 acres (24%) VRM Class II: 132,001 acres (7%) VRM Class III: 531,920 acres (30%) VRM Class IV: 693,995 acres (39%)</p>	<p>Impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree due to decreased acreage managed as VRM Class II.</p> <p>Under Alternative D: VRM Class I: 390,424 acres (22%) VRM Class II: 8,838 acres (<1%) VRM Class III: 692,741 acres (39%) VRM Class IV: 691,119 acres (39%)</p>	<p>Impacts same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree due to increased acreage managed as VRM Classes I and II. Under Alternative E: VRM Class I: 998,370 acres (56%) VRM Class II: 111,478 acres (6%) VRM Class III: 264,369 acres (15%) VRM Class IV: 407,459 acres (23%)</p>	<p>Impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree due to decreased acreage managed as VRM Classes I and II. Under the Proposed Plan: VRM Class I: 422,989 acres (24%) VRM Class II: 228,041 acres (13%) VRM Class III: 507,583 acres (28%) VRM Class IV: 623,002 acres (35%)</p>
Woodlands	Short- and long-term adverse on 1,309,894 acres impacts from harvesting from wildlife habitat loss,	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree since fewer acres would be open	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree since fewer acres would be open	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree since fewer acres would be open	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree since fewer acres would be open to woodland	Same as Alternative C.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	habitat degradation, and habitat fragmentation, and noise disturbance. Long-term beneficial impacts from reduced fire risk from fuel load reductions and thinning, and opening up the forest floor for understory growth. Long-term beneficial impacts from harvesting on sagebrush steppe communities and wildlife.	to woodland harvest. Under Alternative B, 730,074 acres would be open to woodland harvest. Also, limitations on off-road travel and wood product use in the deer and elk winter range (Nov. 1–May 15) would help mitigate the short-term adverse impacts of woodland product collection and harvest on wildlife and habitat.	to woodland harvest. Under Alternative C, 841,938 acres would be open to woodland harvest. Also, wood collection in certain areas would be restricted to within 150 feet of designated routes and permitted off road travel.	to woodland harvest. Under Alternative D, 841,938 acres would be open to woodland harvest but wood collection would not be limited to any buffer zone along designated routes or permitted off road travel.	harvest.	
Note: Management decisions pertaining to air resources, hazardous materials, and paleontology were excluded from analysis because they would have a negligible effect on wildlife and fisheries resources.						
WOODLANDS						
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Proposed Plan
Cultural Resources	Excluding 37,433-acre Grand Gulch Historic District from harvesting opportunities would have long-term, adverse impacts on woodland resources.	Long-term, beneficial impacts on woodlands from fuels reductions around sites. Long-term, adverse impacts from harvesting restrictions on 99,955 acres in CSMA's and cultural protection areas.	Beneficial impacts same as Alternative B. Long-term, adverse impacts from harvesting exclusions on 61,943 acres in CSMA's and cultural protection areas.	Beneficial impacts same as Alternative B. Long-term, adverse impacts from harvesting exclusions on 59,297 acres in CSMA's and cultural protection areas.	Same as Alternative B.	Beneficial impacts same as Alternative B. Long-term, adverse impacts from harvesting exclusions on 41,641 acres in SRMA's and cultural protection areas.
Fire Management	Short-term, adverse impacts from fire treatments through resource loss, surface disturbances, soil compaction and	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A, including limited treatments in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics	Same as Alternative A, but with limited treatments on 88,871 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	erosion, opportunities for exotic species establishment, and restrictions on harvesting in treated areas. Long-term, beneficial impacts from reduced risks of wildland fire and improved fire condition classes, and sustainable yields of woodland products.				(582,360 acres) to reduce wildland fire risks.	reduce wildland fire risks.
Minerals and Energy Resources	Short-term and long-term, adverse, but minor, impacts on woodland productivity from RFD minerals exploration and development affecting less than 0.1% of the area available for minerals development.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	No impacts to woodlands as non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics are not protected or managed under this alternative.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Impacts on woodlands would be adverse in the long term from prohibitions on harvesting on 582,360 acres in woodland zones managed for protection of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. Adverse impacts from limitations on fire suppression and treatments to maintain and improve woodland health.	Long term, adverse impacts from prohibitions on harvesting on 88,871 acres, and limitation on fire suppression and treatments to maintain woodland health.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

Recreation	Long-term, beneficial impacts from unrestricted opportunities for harvesting opportunities in SRMAs and ERMA, except for restrictions on a total of 196,040 acres in ROS P-class areas, 250 acres of developed recreation sites, and along the 1,280-acre Pearson hiking trail. Long-term, adverse impacts from potential reductions in woodland productivity and unsustainable harvesting from relatively few harvesting restrictions in the PA.	Long-term, beneficial impacts from sustainable riparian woodlands resource use along San Juan River. Long-term, adverse impacts from harvesting prohibitions or restrictions on 498,658 acres in SRMAs.	Beneficial impacts same as Alternative B, but reduced adverse impacts from harvesting prohibitions on 122,919 acres in SRMAs.	Same as Alternative C.	Same as Alternative C, but to a more adverse degree, from harvesting prohibitions in SRMAs and in riparian areas (for riparian woodland species) that lie within non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. Long-term, adverse impacts within non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics on 416,526 acres in the ERMA.	Same as Alternative E, except 75,271 acres in the ERMA would have harvesting prohibitions to preserve non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.
Riparian Resources	Long-term, adverse, but minor, impacts from harvesting restrictions in riparian areas (except for Native American harvesting for traditional purposes). Long-term, beneficial impacts from maintained productivity and sustainable harvesting of riparian woodlands.	Same as Alternative A, except long-term, beneficial impacts on riparian woodlands from closing riparian areas to OHV use, protecting riparian woodlands.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B, but with a greater degree of adverse impacts, from prohibitions on riparian woodland harvesting within non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	Same as Alternative B.
Soil and Water	Negligible impacts on woodland resources	Impacts same as for Alternative A Fire	Same as Alternative	Same as Alternative	Long-term, beneficial impacts from	Same as Alternative

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

Resources	or harvesting opportunities because soil and water decisions would not affect woodland resources.	Management from vegetation treatments to control tamarisk. Short term, adverse impacts from harvesting restrictions in treated areas.	B.	B.	vegetation treatments to control tamarisk replacement of and encroachment on riparian woodland stands. Adverse impacts to woodlands from limitations on treatment use in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	B.
Special Designations, WSAs	Long-term, adverse, but minor, impacts on harvesting opportunities from closure of 391,599 acres of WSAs (22% of the FO).	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Special Designations, ACECs	Long-term, adverse, but minor, impacts on harvesting from closure of 139,796 acres within ACECs to woodland harvesting opportunities (8% of the FO).	Same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree, from harvesting restrictions on 522,035 acres in ACECs (29% of the FO).	Same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree, from harvesting restrictions within 37,382 acres of ACECs (2% of the FO)	Minor adverse impacts from woodland harvesting exclusion on 2,146 acres in ACECs.	Same as Alternative B, except adverse impacts to woodland harvesting from harvesting prohibitions within 109,205 acres of proposed ACECs for preservation of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	Same as E, except harvesting prohibitions on 37,382 acres in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics in ACECs.
Special Designations, WSRs	Long-term, adverse, but minor, impacts on harvesting from harvesting exclusions within 7,168 acres along the San Juan River and 1,920 acres along the Colorado River.	Same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree, from harvesting exclusions on 17,888 acres along eligible and recommended river segments.	Beneficial, long-term impacts from few harvesting exclusions except on 6,736 acres along eligible and recommended river segments.	Beneficial, long-term impacts from no harvesting exclusions along all PA river segments (no eligible river segments).	Same as Alternative B.	Adverse impacts from exclusion of harvesting on 6,736 acres on eligible or recommended river segments.
Travel Management	Long-term, adverse	Long-term, adverse	Same as Alternative	Negligible impacts	Long-term, adverse	Long-term, adverse

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	impacts to harvesting opportunities on 276,430 acres designated as closed to OHV use or access.	impacts to harvesting on 423,698 acres closed to OHV use or access (53% more than Alternative A).	A, but to a greater degree, from 418,667 acres closed to OHV use or access (51% more acreage than Alternative A).	on woodland harvesting from no OHV closed areas.	impacts to woodlands harvesting access from designated closed OHV areas (970,436 acres), and 179 miles of OHV routes in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be closed.	impacts to woodlands harvesting access from designated closed OHV areas (393,895 acres)
Vegetation	Short-term, minor, but long-term, indirect, beneficial impacts from vegetation treatments to reduce fuel loads and invasive species on 232,130 acres managed for vegetation treatments.	Long-term beneficial impacts from potential treatment of 2,500 acres/year of pinyon-juniper and riparian woodlands to reduce fuel loading.	Same as Alternative B, but 3,100 acres/year of pinyon-juniper and riparian woodlands would be treated.	Same as Alternative B, but 4,100 acres/year treatments in pinyon-juniper and riparian woodlands.	Same as Alternative B, except some adverse impacts from limitations on treatments in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	Same as Alternative C.
Visual Resources	Long-term, adverse, but minor, impacts on harvesting from scenic protection on 726,687 acres within VRM Class I and Class II areas (41% of the FO).	Same as Alternative A, with 748,309 acres protected for scenic quality under VRM Class I and Class II areas (42% of the FO).	Same as Alternative A, from designation of 557,180 acres under VRM Class I and Class II (31% of the FO).	Same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree, from designation of 399,262 acres under VRM Class I and Class II (22% of FO).	Same as Alternative A, except greater long-term, adverse impacts on woodland harvesting from designation of 998,370 acres as VRM Class I and 111,478 acres as VRM Class II (62% of the FO).	Long term, adverse impacts from designation of 651,030 acres as VRM Class I and Class II (37% of the FO).
Wildlife and Fisheries Resources	Beneficial impacts on woodland resources from riparian habitat protection and control of invasive species.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Woodlands	Beneficial impacts to woodland resources from harvesting opportunities on 73%	Same impacts as Alternative A, except 41% of FO available for harvesting	Same as Alternative A, except 47% of FO (841,936 acres) would be open to	Same as Alternative C.	Impacts the same as non-WSA Wilderness Characteristics impacts above from	Beneficial impacts from allowing harvesting on 841,936 acres (47%

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

	of the FO (1,309,894 acres).	(730,075 acres) in woodland zones, with beneficial impacts from controlled OHV use.	harvesting opportunities.		prohibitions on woodland harvesting and allowed limited treatments within 582,360 acres managed for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. 608,476 acres (34% of the FO) would be beneficially available for woodland harvesting.	of the FO). Minor adverse impacts from 4,000 acres closed to harvesting in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.
--	------------------------------	---	---------------------------	--	---	---

2.3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT ELIMINATED FROM ANALYSIS

This section provides a summary of those alternatives the BLM initially considered but later eliminated, and the justifications for their dismissal from further evaluations.

2.3.1 LIVESTOCK GRAZING

Action: The PA would be unavailable for livestock grazing.

Rationale for Elimination: An alternative that proposes to close the entire PA to grazing would not meet the purposes and needs of this RMP/Draft EIS. NEPA requires that agencies study, develop, and describe appropriate alternatives to recommended courses of action in any proposal that involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources. No issues or conflicts have been identified during this land-use planning effort, which requires the complete elimination of grazing within the PA for their resolution. Where appropriate, closures and adjustments to livestock use have been incorporated into the alternatives on an allotment or area basis to address issues identified in the LUP. Since the BLM has considerable discretion, through its grazing regulations, to determine and adjust stocking levels, seasons-of-use, and grazing management activities, and to allocate forage to uses of the public lands in LUPs, the analysis of an alternative to entirely eliminate grazing is not needed.

An alternative that proposes to close the entire PA to grazing would also be inconsistent with the intent of the Taylor Grazing Act (TGA), which directs the BLM to provide for livestock use of BLM lands, to adequately safeguard grazing privileges, to provide for the orderly use, improvement, and development of the range, and to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range.

The FLPMA requires that public lands be managed on a "multiple use and sustained yield basis" (FLPMA Section 302 [a] and Section 102 [7]) and includes livestock grazing as a principal or major use of public lands. While multiple use does not require that all lands be used for livestock grazing, complete removal of livestock grazing on the entire PA would be arbitrary and would not meet the principle of multiple use and sustained yield.

Livestock grazing is and has been an important use of the public lands in the PA for many years, and is a continuing government program. Although the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) guidelines for compliance with NEPA require that agencies analyze Alternative A (the No Action Alternative) in all EISs, for the purposes of this NEPA analysis, Alternative A is to continue the status quo, which includes livestock grazing (CEQ Forty Most Asked Questions, Question 3). For this reason and those stated above, a no-grazing alternative for the entire PA has been dismissed from further consideration in this LUP.

2.3.2 TRAVEL MANAGEMENT

Action: Travel on roads would be eliminated based upon a model that uses distances from roads so as to protect solitude and remoteness.

Rationale for Elimination: An alternative that proposes to close the roads based on this model in the PA would not meet the purposes and needs of this RMP/Draft EIS. No issues or conflicts have been identified during this land-use planning effort that requires this particular method for

determining which roads would be designated and which areas would remain open, limited, or closed to cross-country travel. Since the BLM has considerable discretion through its regulations, the analysis of an alternative to close roads based on this model is not needed. The BLM did consider the idea of remoteness and solitude and provided protection for these values in a reasonable range of alternatives. Alternative E protects non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics by closing these lands to OHV travel. Additionally, Alternative B closes all WSAs to OHV use. Instead, the BLM chose to take a hard look at each route and measure the purpose and need for that particular route against resource conflicts.

This methodology was presented in the travel report and was the basis for the range of alternatives for travel management.

2.3.3 ENLARGE CANYONLANDS NATIONAL PARK

Action: Enlarge Canyonlands National Park to include Lockhart Basin.

Rationale for Elimination: An alternative that proposes to enlarge Canyonlands National Park to include Lockhart Basin has been proposed many times in the media and discussion with interested groups. However, no complete serious proposal has ever been brought forward. This would not meet the purposes and needs of this RMP/Draft EIS. No issues or conflicts have been identified during this land-use planning effort that requires this particular method for determining which roads would be designated and which areas would remain open, limited, or closed to cross country travel.

2.3.4 NO LEASING ALTERNATIVE

Action: During scoping and/or the comment period for the Draft RMP/EIS, it was suggested that the BLM should address a "No-Leasing Alternative" because the "No-Leasing Alternative" is the equivalent of the "No Action Alternative" that must be analyzed in all EISs.

Rationale for Elimination: The "No-Leasing Alternative" in an RMP revision is actually an action alternative because where lands have already been leased, the no-action for NEPA purposes continues to allow for (honor) valid existing rights. Proposing a "No-Leasing Alternative" would require revisiting existing leases and either buying them back from the lessee, or allowing them to expire on their own terms. The first option (buying back), is outside the scope of any RMP. This is a political decision that the BLM has no authority to undertake in planning. As a result, the BLM does not regularly include a "No-Leasing Alternative."

The purpose and need for the LUP is to identify and resolve potential conflicts between competing resource uses rather than to eliminate a principle use of the public lands in the Monticello FO Area. Leasing of the public lands for oil and gas exploration and production is required by the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended, and the BLM's current policy is to apply the least restrictive management constraints to the principal uses of the public lands necessary to achieve resource goals and objectives. A field office-wide "No-Leasing Alternative" would be an unnecessarily restrictive alternative for mineral exploration and production on the public lands.

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA Section 102 [E]) requires that agencies *"study, develop, and describe appropriate alternatives to recommended courses of action in any proposal which involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available*

resources." No issues or conflicts have been identified during this land-use planning effort, which requires the complete elimination of oil and gas leasing within the planning area for their resolution. The BLM's Land Use Planning Handbook (BLM MANUAL Rel. 1-1693), Appendix C. item H. requires that LUPs identify areas as open or unavailable for leasing.

Given the potential range of decisions available in the Draft RMP/Draft EIS, the analyzed alternatives include no leasing for certain areas; but a field office-wide "No-Leasing Alternative" is not necessary in order to resolve issues and protect other resource values and uses.

As mentioned above, a "No-Leasing Alternative" should not be confused with the "No Action Alternative" for purposes of NEPA compliance. Leasing and No Leasing on the public lands has previously been analyzed in several NEPA documents. In 1973, the Department of Interior published the Final Environmental Impact Statement on the Federal Upland Oil and Gas Leasing Program (USDI, 1973). The proposed action was to lease Federal lands for production of oil and natural gas resources. Alternatives included the No Action Alternative, which at initiation of the program was "No Leasing." To supplement that EIS, the BLM prepared a series of Environmental Assessments (then titled "Environmental Analysis Records or EARs") including the 1975 Oil and Gas Program Environmental Analysis Record (EAR), 1975 which addressed oil and gas leasing for the public lands in the Monticello FO area. Alternatives again included the No Action or "No Leasing" alternative. The outcome was a category system for leasing which categorized all public and USFS lands into four groups: 1) open to leasing with standard lease stipulations, 2) Special Stipulations to address special concerns, 3) No surface occupancy and 4) No Leasing. Since completion of the EAR in 1975 oil and gas leasing in the Monticello FO Area has been an ongoing federal program under the established categories.

The Council on Environmental Quality (Section 1502.14[d] of NEPA) requires the alternatives analysis in an EIS to "include the alternative of no action", but explains that there are two distinct interpretations of "no action" that must be considered, depending on the nature of the proposal being evaluated. "The first situation might involve an action such as updating a land management plan where ongoing programs initiated under existing legislation and regulations will continue, even as new plans are developed. In these cases "no action" is "no change" from current management direction or level of management intensity. To construct an alternative that is based on no management at all would be a useless academic exercise. Therefore, the "no action" alternative may be thought of in terms of continuing with the present course of action until that action is changed." (CEQ Forty Most Asked Questions, Question 3). Therefore, for the Monticello Proposed Plan/Final EIS, the "No-Action Alternative" is to continue the status quo, which is to lease under the oil and gas stipulations (formerly categories) established in the San Juan RMP.

2.3.5 LIVESTOCK GRAZING ADJUSTMENTS ALTERNATIVE

Action: During scoping and comment on the Draft EIS it was suggested that the BLM consider adjustments to livestock numbers, livestock management practices, and the kind of livestock grazed on allotments within the Monticello FO to benefit wildlife and protect and promote land health including soils, hydrologic cycles and biotic integrity.

Rationale for Elimination: BLM policy regarding adjustments to the levels of livestock use authorized is to monitor and inventory range conditions under existing stocking levels and make adjustments to livestock use as indicated by this data to help assure that Rangeland Health

Standards (RHS) and resource objectives are met. Regulations at 43 CFR 4130.3 require that the terms and conditions under which livestock are authorized "ensure conformance with the provisions of subpart 4180" (Standards for Rangeland Health) and further that "livestock grazing use shall not exceed the livestock carrying capacity of the allotment." It would be inappropriate and unfeasible to estimate and allocate the available forage, design specific management practices and determine if changes to the kind of livestock are necessary for each allotment in the Monticello FO or in the area as a whole in the RMP/EIS. Such changes would not be supportable considering the type and amount of data required and the analysis necessary to make such changes.

According to BLM policy decisions regarding authorized livestock use levels and the terms and conditions under which they are managed is an implementation decision (H-1610-1, Appendix C, Page 15). The BLM assesses RHS, conducts monitoring and inventories, and evaluates this data on a periodic basis, normally on an allotment and/or watershed basis. After NEPA analysis, necessary changes to livestock management and implementation of Utah's Guidelines for Rangeland Management are implemented through a proposed decision in accordance with 43CFR 4160. These decisions determine the exact levels of use by livestock in conformance with the LUP and to meet resource objectives and maintain or enhancing land health. For these reasons this alternative has been dismissed from further consideration in this land use plan revision."